The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1922 No. 2951

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 83

EDITORIALS:
- The Poison of Poincaré 86
- The Third Degree 86
- Banks and the Farmers 87
- Why Amnesty Matters 87
- The Newest Battle of the Books 88

THE INJUNCTION—A WEAPON OF INDUSTRIAL POWER. By Albert De Silver 89

THE STOCK-YARDS STRIKE. By Benjamin Stolberg 91

WHAT HOPE FOR CHINA? By Nathaniel Peffer 93

THE DIARY OF SIR ROGER CASEMENT 94

DISPUTED TREAD. By Hazel Hall 95

THE MAN WHO CARRIED THE MESSAGE TO GARCIA. By Arnold Mulder 96

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 96

CORRESPONDENCE 97

BOOKS:
- The Roving Critic. By Carl Van Doren 98
- Remy de Gourmont. By L. L. 99
- Religious Knowledge in Homeopathic Doses. By Preserved Smith 100
- One of Our Minorities. By Walter F. White 101
- The Emotional Life of a Schoolgirl. By Katharine Anthony 102

DRAMA:
- Andreev and Vildrac. By Ludwig Lewisohn 103

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
- Where Belgian Labor Stands 105
- Tiutiuniuk and His Polish Friends 106
- A Latin-American Boycott 108

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN
NORMAN THOMAS

ERNEST H. GRUENING, Managing Editor
CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

Contributing Editors

JOHN A. HOBSON ANATOLE FRANCE H. L. MENCKEN
FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

Subscription Rates—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

THAT was a cruel blow which the Supreme Council gave the League of Nations in refusing to permit it to cooperate in the Genoa parley. The League has hard sledding; both Poland and Lithuania reject its award in the Vilna affair. But the cruelest and most illuminating comment comes from its own friend, the New York *World*. "The Council," it reports, "decided that the League court shall meet at the Hague on January 30. . . . One of the first questions to be considered is whether the judges of the court shall wear robes and if so what."

WITH Senator Johnson out against the Four-Power Treaty the situation in Washington comes more and more to resemble that following the Peace of Versailles. The wisdom, from Mr. Harding's point of view, of making Senators Lodge and Underwood delegates to the Conference becomes more apparent. They are expected to deliver the necessary numbers of fellow-Republicans and Democrats to obtain ratification. Alas for such clever maneuvers, the opposition is rising day by day, some of it specious, some of it malicious, but much of it based on sound instinct and good judgment. Unless vitally amended, both as to the Japanese main islands and to what the consultations in case of aggression may lead, the treaty ought to be defeated. Even so amended it would remain a legitimation of stolen property in the Pacific. Meanwhile the entire Conference appears to be shell-shocked by what has happened in Paris. One good thing is reported—that Mr. Hughes will not finish with the naval treaty until a Shantung agreement is arrived at. We hope it is true. Without that and other substantial relief for China the Pacific discussions are a failure. Real evacuation of Shantung by Japan should be a minimum for the Conference.

TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY must be a royal friend to his friends. In the Senate discussion of the $200,000 or more spent in his primary campaign—spent, he swears, without his knowledge or consent—it was revealed that his campaign managers made frequent trips to see him in New York during the campaign and that their hotel bills were charged to Newberry. He says he did not know it. "I have numerous friends, and I have always permitted and encouraged my children when they travel, when they were going to the theater in New York, to go to the hotel and charge their accounts to me. I cannot say that these bills were not paid. I say I have no knowledge of their payment. . . . We may all of us have enthusiastic friends. . . ." But few of us have such enthusiastic and casual bill-paying friends as Mr. Newberry. Nor, he says, did he know that his brother John put $99,000 into the campaign "out of love and loyalty and affection," or that when his brother's account was overdrawn sums were transferred from his, Truman's, account to the brother's and thence to the campaign committee. Probably he was unaware even that the photographs taken of him in a naval commander's uniform on the wooden recruiting ship in Union Square, New York, were used to delude Michigan folk into believing him a real salt-water fighting man. His part in the campaign he expresses thus: "Because of heart interest I was on the sideline howling and yowling for my side as loud as I could." Such is the honest millionaire who has just been seated in the Senate by 46 votes to 41.

"A NEW kind of Senator"—so Boies Penrose's successor George Wharton Pepper is described in the press. *New?* The type is ever with us. Mr. Pepper is a man of great wealth inherited from a brewer grandfather who put his profits into real estate. He possesses a certain family distinction, and unquestioned legal and oratorical ability; he can make a learned address, or keep the galleries in roars of laughter if he pleases. He has been extremely successful in mixing piety and business, in posing as a reformer and yet being quite ready to back the political bosses if need be. He has been known to seek guidance by prayer on his knees in clients' offices and he was one of the ablest and most determined protagonists of preparedness and war—all in the name of Jesus Christ. Writing to the New York *Times* in praise of his appointment a friend declares that Mr. Pepper "should make an excellent Senator of a very conscientious type, keen for the preservation of property rights." An abler man than Henry Cabot Lodge, he is of the same breed, the scholar in politics, knowing how to be "practical" at the right time. To which it need only be added that Senator Pepper's first vote was piously given to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Newberry, and was one of four which assured to that Senator his property-right in the seat his family and friends purchased for him. As between a Pepper and a Penrose we are for a Penrose every time; he can be counted on to show what he is, with or without benefit of clergy.

WHEN an English Viceroy delivered Dublin Castle to that erstwhile hunted rebel, Michael Collins, the event was as significant as it was dramatic. A difficulty in setting up the Free State appears in the existence of the Dail side by side with the Provisional Government. But the personnel of both is a guaranty of cooperation in framing the new constitution. Both friends and foes of the treaty agree that at least pending the final adoption of a constitution and the election of a parliament under it, the republican machinery must be kept intact. This is a sound precaution in any event, but in so far as it is given special emphasis by doubt of British good faith the amnesty granted Irish political prisoners in the name of the King and the orderly evacuation of Ireland by British troops give happy augury for the future. The opponents of the treaty, who number among them men and women of great devotion and intellectual power, have concentrated on winning the Sinn Fein clubs. A republican party in the Free State will serve a wholesome purpose so long as its methods do not disrupt fundamental Irish unity or distract attention from pressing economic problems. One may have a republic or a Free State without having free men, as Americans can testify. It is significant for the future that the first task of the new regime was to obtain a postponement of the threatened railroad strike. That it was able to do so is an evidence of strength. The formation of a real cooperative commonwealth will require as much intelligence and devotion as the fight against foreign political domination.

THE civil war that threatens in China should not be taken as corroboration of those who depict China as a land of chaos with a people inherently incapable of orderly government. On the contrary, it is another sign of a growing spirit of national unity and growing capacity for self-government. It is the healthy and natural rebellion of any people against a government serving alien masters. The new Peking Cabinet headed by Liang-Shih-yi has not only attempted to betray China by secretly yielding to Japan on Shantung; almost its first act was to place in office Tao-Ju-lin and Lut-Sung-yu, two notoriously pro-Japanese ex-Ministers who were driven from office in 1919 for their betrayals to Japan in payment for loans. Then it pardoned the equally notorious Anfu gang, the nine members of the pro-Japanese Government which was overthrown in 1920. When the arrest of these men was ordered on charges of malfeasance and treason they fled to the Japanese Legation, where they have been given shelter as fugitives from justice ever since. The combination of these acts inflamed the Chinese people, and Wu-Pei-fu, a liberal military man who has the confidence of the educated classes, has set out to overthrow the Government by force. That Wu-Pei-fu would eventually strike to get control of the Government was certain. The actions of the new Cabinet have given him an opportunity to make the effort now with a maximum of popular support. It is to be hoped he will win. If he does it will be a new warning to corrupt Chinese officials that they cannot serve Japan, a renewed warning to Japan that it can no longer successfully suborn treason, and a new proof to the world that China is determined ultimately to be master in its own house.

NOT the Irish negotiations or the Washington or Genoa Conferences are of more potential importance for the peace and happiness of mankind than the overtures made by the Indian Moderates to Gandhi and his followers, apparently with the tacit consent of the Government. Yet of these negotiations we have only the baldest news. It would appear that Gandhi has consented to enter a Round Table Conference looking toward the establishment of India as a free dominion within the British Empire and the settlement of the question of the Caliphate, provided that as evidence of good faith the Government at once releases all political prisoners. He on his part will abstain from pushing civil disobedience, but not from the work of organizing for it in case negotiations should fail.

FRANCE has denounced her "most favored nation" customs treaty with Spain. The Minister of Commerce, M. Dior, says that the denunciation is due to the action of the Spanish Government which in reply to recent changes in the French customs regulations retaliated, raising the duties, insisting on payment in gold, and imposing a further tax to compensate for the present low value of the franc. The French assert that this puts their important fisheries interests in Spain at a disadvantage as compared with Norway's and their cotton interests at a disadvantage as compared with England's. The Spanish claim that their action was a reply to French discrimination against their wines. But the episode adds to the ever-growing diplomatic and spiritual isolation of France; and it has a world-wide significance indicated by the comment of the London *Economist* that "the Franco-Spanish rupture probably marks the opening volley in the great pending tariff battle for which most of the nations of the world have been maneuvering for many months past." That would be a calamity.

ORGANIZED labor in the State of New York is aligning itself against a measure which the legislature will be asked to pass, setting up compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes somewhat as in Kansas. The proposal, initiated by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, is that the State Industrial Commissioner shall have the authority to intervene in labor controversies and to attempt to settle them by mediation. He shall be allowed thirty days to accomplish this during which it shall be unlawful for employees to call a strike or for employers to put into effect a lockout. At the end of thirty days, if no settlement has been reached, the Commissioner, the employer, the employees, or a group of ten citizens may carry the case to the Supreme Court, which shall adjudicate the controversy if it regards it as one affecting the "public interest." Violation of the provisions of the measure is punishable as contempt of court. Whatever the theoretical case may be for compulsory arbitration, it is certain that it cannot be inaugurated successfully in opposition to the wishes of organized labor. Moreover, as long as the courts are indirectly controlled by the business and employing classes, as is the case in the United States, labor is justified in regarding adjudication by such means as a method of taking away an essential offensive and defensive weapon of the workers—the strike.

THE battle of injunctions now on in the garment trade in New York is likely to have at least one salutary result—the reduction to an absurdity of that particular method of defense. Almost invariably the injunction

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been the weapon of capital, but sometimes capital carries its use of this weapon too far for its own good. A recent example of this has occurred in New York, where the American Cloak and Suit Manufacturers' Association secured an injunction restraining the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union from picketing, holding strike meetings, paying strike benefits, and "conspiring unlawfully" to injure the business of the plaintiffs. This injunction was so absurd and flagrant that on application by Samuel Untermyer, of counsel for the strikers, it was suspended by the judge who granted it. But even before that the union had turned the tables on the bosses and for the first time in American industrial history labor obtained an injunction restraining the employers from violating their contract with the union. This injunction, at first temporary, has now been made permanent, and the employers are obediently opening their shops and taking back their men, their docility being due in part, no doubt, to the fact that the agreement runs only to June 1. The absurdity of the injunction against the union coupled with labor's successful counterblast has done something to convince the public and the press that this particularly noxious weapon should be abandoned in all civilized industrial wars.

OUR State Department formally denies that only American assent is lacking to make operative a plan for suspending for a period of twenty years the liens now held on Austrian revenues by the Allied and Associated Governments. If this is done future credits can be advanced for the purchase of food. But on the State Department's own showing the United States is one of the two principal powers that have not taken the decisive action without which Austria is condemned to starve. And our claim is only for the comparatively small sum—approximately $24,000,000—due us for food already sent to save the starving! We are sure that an informed public opinion will compel Congress to pass the simple legislation which will enable us to cooperate in meeting a desperate need. Mr. Edward A. Filene, in the News Bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association for January 6, 1922, suggests a form of resolution which may be useful. In this Austrian matter, as in many others, that Association is bringing accurate information and adequate discussion to bear on the formation of post-war policies. Its proposed conferences to be held in New York during the next ten weeks promise the sort of enlightenment on China, the Near East, Mexico, Haiti, and Russia which may prevent such hurt to others as in our careless ignorance we have done to the people of Austria.

THE United States offers no asylum to aliens of radical persuasion; Oskari Tokoi, premier of the Finnish Socialist Republic of 1917-1918, has been arrested and is faced with probable deportation. But the United States welcomes to its shores aliens with a record of anti-radical terrorism: Secretary Hughes has approved the application of Ataman Semionov for a special permit to enter the country for six months. We believe the Ataman should be let in, though he is an unconvicted murderer and a terrorist of ghastly reputation. We believe that he should be allowed to negotiate, with any one who is willing to talk to him, for the support of his nefarious projects of counter-revolution in the Far East. We believe this because we believe that freedom of movement and speech should be allowed to any man, however vile, who has not been convicted of crime and legally segregated. But what of Oskari Tokoi, who is known as a strong supporter of Finnish independence, who fought the Germans and became a British colonel in the process, who has criticized the methods of the Bolsheviki, and whose only crime is that he is a Socialist? Shall we let in the murderer Semionov and throw Tokoi out?

LONG surviving the cruel blow which robbed her of all her children at once and enduring with heroism years of bedridden suffering, Katrina Trask Peabody's spirit rose above pain. Her pen was devoted to the cause of peace among men and her earnestness gave her writings a wide circulation. Her fortitude, her determination that she remain of the world though shut from it, and her unfailing generosity—such that the tradesmen in as worldly a place as Saratoga closed their stores during the funeral of one they had not seen for fifteen years: these are evidences of an unselfishness and heroism that can never wholly perish.

A FRANZ SCHUBERT Memorial Committee has been organized to commemorate by a series of twelve concerts the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the composer's birth. Nothing more agreeable and fruitful could happen in the musical life of New York. We only hope that in these concerts the songs will be given their rightful preeminence over the orchestral works. In this day of cerebral music it is often forgotten that the great romantic song writers, despite the pure melodic beauty they so constantly achieved, not only had brains but used them. Schubert interpreted his pets with magnificent insight. And the poets were often great poets. Thus he interpreted the two major odes of Klopstock, Goethe's Willkommen und Abschied (op. 56.1), König in Thule (op. 5.5), and vied with Beethoven in Nur wer die Sehnsucht kennt (op. 62.4), in which he was followed by Tchaikovski and Hugo Wolf. He followed these by songs based upon the work of Novalis, Rückert, and Heine and often combined, as in Das Meer erglänzte (Schwanengesang No. 12), marvelous descriptive and dramatic effects with the perfect enchantment of his period and his genius.

"AMUNDSEN Plans 5-Year Polar Trip," reads the headline in a metropolitan newspaper. Below we find an interview with the explorer who, comfortably installed in a steam-heated New York hotel, tranquilly talks of his intention to leave all this behind and plunge once more into the Arctic wilderness not to emerge—if ever—for five long years. And we wonder. For Roald Amundsen is not a young man bitten with the desire for fame and fortune. He is fifty years of age, in comfortable circumstances, and possessed of timeless fame as the discoverer of the South Pole. Why seek further, why suffer longer, why risk more? To many minds polar exploration, in any circumstances, is useless and foolhardy—a waste of life and opportunity. How much more so then is the new Odyssey of Amundsen! Well, perhaps. Then we pick up the newspaper again and on the same page with the Amundsen interview we note other headings: "Gov. Miller Accuses Hylan of Bad Faith," "Bismarck Likened Kaiser to 'Untrained Dog,'" "Jamaica Rum the Real Milk Found in These Cocoanuts." And we wonder again. How much is Amundsen leaving behind? Is he wasting his time or—brutal thought—are we possibly mistaken in believing we are making so much better use of ours?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Poison of Poincaré

IT is a good thing for the world that Raymond Poincaré, bitter anti-German, determined anti-bolshevist, protagonist of strict enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles, of Allied revision of German taxation, of French seizure of "guaranties" in the Ruhr, an old-style diplomat whose prewar secret negotiations with Czarist Russia did much to provoke the war, the most powerful critic of Briand's every step toward reconciliation and common reconstruction of Europe, should assume the premiership of France. M. Poincaré, in or out of office, tended to control French policy. It is better that he be in office and be sobered by responsibility. Time and again M. Briand has gone against his own better knowledge because of fear of M. Poincaré and his supporters.

Now M. Poincaré ceases to play the destructive critic and assumes the responsibilities of office. He may continue rattling his sword, but he can no longer shout continuously that a little sword-rattling is all that is needed to win billions of gold marks for France; he will have to prove it. When he fails to prove it—as he will if he holds office long enough to try out his policies—his militaristic policies will at last have been discredited inside of France, and nothing could do more for the peace of Europe than that. M. Poincaré has been as a poison in the French system; it is better that he have his hour that France may then be purged of him than that he remain a continuing source of disease.

We write these lines before M. Poincaré has made his program speech to the French Chamber, and we do not know what will then happen. It is possible that a Chamber which has had time to reflect may then and there defeat M. Poincaré, as the Chamber defeated M. Ribot on his appearance in 1913. But that now seems unlikely, for the present Chamber, elected when the war passions were still hot, has not yet learned the first lesson of European economics, that no nation can achieve reconstruction alone. It is possible also that M. Poincaré, once in office, may yield to the same economic compulsion which forced M. Briand from his earlier path, and follow the moderate course he has so bitterly attacked. It matters little who holds the wheel; the important question is to what port he is steering.

Announcement of the Conference of Genoa, at which Germans and Russians were to parley with Frenchmen, Italians, and Britons on the common plight of Europe, seemed to indicate that the pilots had at last agreed upon a course. M. Poincaré's advent means a postponement of that reconciliation policy, but when M. Poincaré or his policies are discredited there will be left no formidable opponent of that concert of all Europe without which no real reconstruction is possible. The evidence of its need accumulates daily. Britain's trade figures just made public give a dramatic presentation of the economic forces behind Mr. Lloyd George's policy. She exported only three and a half billion dollars worth of goods in 1921 as against nearly seven billions in 1920. Foreign trade is England's meat and sustenance, and in a single year it has been *cut in half*. The meaning of such figures seems obvious. M. Poincaré insists that "the economic and financial reconstruction of France is essential to the reconstruction of Europe." Europe needs statesmen who think, not in such inverted terms of partial truth, but in the larger terms that the reconstruction of all Europe is essential to the reconstruction of any nation.

France has in these unhappy years since the armistice played the part of the mad bull in Europe's china-shop, and M. Poincaré has been largely responsible for that madness. If France, by accepting him for a time as her leader, can rid herself of him for good, we may well believe that whatever immediate damage he may do his advent is a sign of approaching peace.

The Third Degree

NEW YORK newspapers and the press generally have devoted columns to the killing of two policemen by a young Negro named Luther Boddy, and to the trial and conviction of William Hoey for shooting a patrolman. The latter case attracted particular attention because after the crime Hoey, "wanted" as the murderer, traveled to Sing Sing prison to get the Catholic chaplain, Father Cashin, to come to New York with him as a protector. Hoey denied his guilt but his appearance at the scene of the crime was unquestioned, and while he must have known that his chances of escaping conviction were slight he did not fear to surrender and stand trial. He was, however, in mortal terror of the treatment that he would receive at the hands of policemen after he had given himself up. When he was finally brought to the police station its captain was quoted in the press as saying to the policemen lined up there, "Now, boys, you mustn't touch this skunk; you know he's been photographed." Hoey has now been convicted and sentenced to a long term in prison, but he escaped what to him was a far deadlier terror, manhandling by the New York police.

Boddy is a Negro 22 years old with a "record." He had been arrested a number of times charged with various kinds of theft, but no crime of violence against a person appears in his record. In any event he had fallen into that luckless group which has no rights that any policeman need respect and for which the ordinary police restraints no longer exist. On a dozen or more previous occasions he had been "examined" at the station-house and let go. Now the interrogatory to which men of his type are often subjected has long been vaguely familiar to the American public. It was better known some twenty years ago when the muckraking magazines, uncovering various abuses in our body politic and social, held up to public indignation the notorious "third degree." A flurry of reform followed; the public temper subsided but the "third degree" has persisted, an unofficially recognized police institution. In general the process consists of taking the prisoner into a rear room where he is beaten and kicked. The alleged justification that this process is needed to extract information is not only usually false but wholly irrelevant; the practice has degenerated into a form of sport or the venting of spite against men whom the police regard as continual and potential enemies. Information extracted by such methods often bears no relation to truth and is sometimes the means of incriminating innocent persons. It is not difficult to reconstruct what happened to Boddy. The 38th Precinct station-house in the heart of Harlem's "black belt" has an unenviable reputation for the ill-treatment of those who run afoul of its officers. Boddy is a slight lad weighing not more than 135 pounds. He had declared himself without information on the crime about which the two detective sergeants were questioning him. When he was told to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"come along" he knew exactly what to expect. What followed when the green lights of the station-house came into the terrified boy's view had better be left for development at the trial. But that he was in mortal fear of an immediate future which he sought to escape at any cost can scarce be doubted. He was "so tired of being beaten up all the time" was his explanation when arrested.

There is no attempt here to mitigate Boddy's offense. His appearance and history give the impression not of a "criminal type," using this term in the loose sense generally employed, but of a youngster starting wrong and then being pushed further into the path of conflict with the law and its authorized representatives. He carried a gun, and two New York policemen are dead. Both were men with large families. Was Boddy alone responsible? He was the instrument, his hand pulled the trigger, and the law will surely exact from him the penalty. But the death of Detective Sergeants Buckley and Miller and the bereavement of their families may no less certainly be laid at the door of the third degree, that system for which the whole Police Department is responsible. While it continues, while men fear it more deeply than death itself and are willing to risk their lives to flee from it, the policemen will continue to face needless sacrifice. The Hoey and the Boddy cases should furnish an unmistakable lesson. In the interest of the police as well as of the community it is time to end this violation of the law by its own guardians.

Banks and the Farmers

MONEY and credit which men invented to simplify trade and commerce have proved useful but unruly and troublesome servants. Never were questions with regard to them more acute, and rarely has the ratio of passion, prejudice, and self-interest to a cool understanding of the problem been higher. Europe's fiscal restoration is immensely more difficult because it is approached through a maze of politics. Most programs assume American assistance; but while many look to American methods as models for a reconstructed monetary system in Europe, our fiscal system itself is under violent attack. The conviction is growing among farmers that the Government's financial policy and in particular the activities of the Federal Reserve Board are responsible for their sorry plight. Senator Ladd estimates that in 1919 a policy of unwarranted inflation cost the farmers $6,000,000,000 and that the drastic deflation which followed cost the farmers "$14,000,000,000 on the 1920 crop and $18,000,000,000 on the 1921 crop." Hence from agricultural regions have come various attacks upon the system to which city bankers (many of whom opposed its adoption) attribute our escape from disaster. The mildest form of that attack is the bill supported by the agricultural bloc requiring the President to appoint a "dirt farmer" as a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

Against this measure the Advisory Council of the Board protests. It cites impressive figures to disprove the contention that the Board discriminated against the farmers. Federal Reserve Banks expanded instead of contracting credit to the farmers in the autumn of 1920, "at which time the Reserve Banks in industrial sections were lending to Reserve Banks in agricultural sections $267,000,000. . . . Between May 4, 1920, and April 28, 1921, the loans of the Federal Reserve System to member banks in *non-agricultural* counties *decreased* 28.5 per cent, and those to member banks in semi-agricultural counties *decreased* 0.2 per cent, while loans to members banks in *agricultural* counties actually *increased* 56.6 per cent." The Advisory Council suggests several conservative changes and makes it clear that it has no objection to the appointment of a farmer to the Board if he is the best man. But it does object—and we think rightly—to the principle of class representation on the Board. The Reserve Board is or ought to be a body of technical experts. If at present its members are discriminating against any class they are recreant to their duty as experts and the remedy does not lie in demanding occupational representation, but in restoring the Board to its expert function. It may also lie in providing better supplementary machinery for farm credits. The Reserve system was primarily intended for the credit needs of commerce and finance and in the nature of things cannot in equally adequate fashion meet the credit needs of farmers.

There is, we think, a danger lest the organized farmers put the cart before the horse in their economic program. Assuredly money and credit are important, and we must give them a degree of attention both in their national and international aspects which heretofore has been lacking. Nevertheless the way in which they are manipulated by governmental agencies or private banks is ultimately dependent on the more fundamental question of the ownership of real wealth and power. If banks and natural resources are owned and controlled by a privileged class that class will find a way to profit at the expense of the many under any fiscal system. Far more helpful to the farmers or industrial workers than the presence of one of their own number on the Reserve Board would be the growth of cooperative banks which might join the Federal Reserve System. That is why we welcome the news that the General Executive Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers is organizing a cooperative bank at Chicago, following the example of the bank of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers at Cleveland and the machinists' bank in Washington.

Why Amnesty Matters

HOW pitifully limited was the Administration's approach to amnesty is indicated in the analysis by the Civil Liberties Union of the twenty-four pardons or commutations of sentence granted by the President. Only Debs and two others fall in the class of unrepentant political prisoners for whose release there was no mitigating excuse. And Mr. Daugherty makes a stupid apology for Debs's release.

Something very definite and important will have been lost by the American people if they persist in regarding amnesty as a matter of mercy or at best a grudging recognition that to release a few prisoners may silence an annoying clamor. Much of the hope for the future depends upon a clear recognition that since "heresy is the growing point of society" it is socially disastrous to punish it by legal penalties. All progress begins in a protest against generally accepted opinion, and the menace of the prophet or pioneer—even if in particular instances his theories do not stand the test of practice—is not comparable to the menace of the demagogue who caters to popular passion and ancient taboos. Particularly in an age and a country where schools, printing press, moving pictures, sound amplifiers are so many means for the regimentation of minds, and democracy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is interpreted not as an incentive to think for oneself but as a constraint to think like one's neighbors, it is important to insist in season and out of season that a society which punishes heretics as America punishes her political prisoners is a society which is committing slow suicide.

What was the offense of our political prisoners? Simply this—that in a time of emergency they begged their fellow men to believe that America's entry into or prolongation of the Great War could serve no useful social purpose. Some made their points crudely enough but none gave aid to the enemy, supported Kaiserism, or was guilty of any overt act against the Government. Assuredly their conduct was not cowardly. Silence would have won them immunity; an occasional speech before a working-class audience in favor of purchasing liberty bonds would have won favor for Debs or Doran in the highest circles. Neither were the political prisoners anti-social. No man can be loyal to society who is disloyal to his own conviction. To believe that war in general or a given war in particular is a curse not a blessing, that it will frustrate rather than achieve the ends for which it is avowedly fought, and yet to hold one's peace—that is the real crime against one's own conscience and against one's fellows. The belief that opposition to a war must be suppressed as aid to the enemy means an enormous increase in the difficulty of winning a negotiated peace. It is commonly assumed, for example, that what Debs wanted in the last war was chimerical if not pernicious, that there was no way out but the decisive defeat of the Central Powers. Yet how tragic was the peace won by the advocates of "force without stint or limit"! What misery might have been avoided had American opposition to an imperialist war, such as was voiced by Mr. Debs, led to a negotiated peace!

But supposing Debs was wrong, believing as he did ought he to have kept still, or having spoken ought he to have been imprisoned? The conventional answer of a certain school of liberals is that in the great emergency of war it is necessary or indeed inevitable that the active opponent of war should be silenced by imprisonment or segregation. How great are the implications of this argument! How untenable become the rhetorical assertions about popular enthusiasm for war and the will of the people behind it if one pacifist "agitator" is so serious a menace! Even so it at least becomes the duty of the liberal after the madness subsides, to obtain the release of men who, he believes, were rightly imprisoned simply to prevent the spread of the contagion of their ideas. Yet even this cautious protest, not against the original imprisonment of the dissenter, but its continuance after the crisis has passed, is seldom heard.

One reason for hostility to amnesty is the fact that the critic of war is the critic of the social order. There may be peace with Germany, there is not peace within the social order, and our political prisoners are probably confined as much for fear of what they may do as for anger for what they have done. It is very hard for a dominant class to recognize that not mercy or even justice but sound social policy requires toleration of its enemies. Amnesty as an act of mercy has little social value; as an act of justice it is invaluable. To be unconcerned for the fate of our political prisoners is to invite the settlement of all questions not by discussion but by relentless conflict between groups which will use their control of political machinery remorselessly against their opponents. It is to invite also the death of that regard for personality which is imperative if we are to escape a mechanized society and a servile state.

The Newest Battle of the Books

THE biggest melee which has yet come off in the conflict now raging over the history textbooks used by the New York public schools is credibly reported to have taken place last Sunday night in the office of David Hirshfield, Commissioner of Accounts, who has been charged with the task of investigating the books and reporting on them. Mr. Hirshfield, after reading a book a day for weeks, it seems, had grown weary of his task and had gone off leaving all the volumes under question in his office. Night fell and the histories woke.

"Lord, how these investigators maul us!" said one, rubbing his bruises. "What did I do? Left Nathan Hale out. Of course I also left out Plymouth Rock and Peter Stuyvesant's Wooden Leg and Washington's Cherry Tree and Lincoln's Pig in the Mudhole. And now what do I get? All the monument-makers are after me on account of my indignity to the Rock; and all the artificial-limb crowd on account of my neglect of the Leg. The members of the Society for The-Truth-the-Whole-Truth-and-Nothing-but-the-Truth abuse me for leaving out the Tree. The Hard Road enthusiasts say I have taken away their credit by letting it be forgotten how bad the highways used to be before they did their work. Now as to Nathan Hale——"

"All I did," broke in another volume, "was to call John Hancock a smuggler. What taught me? The Eighteenth Amendment. Here I saw everybody—even teetotalers—glorying in the name of Bootlegger and Hip-Flask Fellow and I thought I could bring the Revolution up to date by showing that Hancock and the Boston merchants looked at some things in a very modern way. But now I find——"

"I made my break," said a third, "during the late war when we were the allies of Britain and blood was thicker than water and all the hands were across the sea. I merely said that the British soldiers who marched up Bunker Hill were brave men or they would never have dared to face Our Boys with such——"

But here certain antiquated textbooks lying in a corner burst out with torrents of abuse, shouting "Anglophiles!" and "Radicals!" and "Internationalists!" and "Pacifists!" and such neat arguments.

"You fellows all talk with a brogue," said the Bunker Hill heretic in a cutting tone.

"It sounds Teutonic to me," snapped the harrier of Hancock.

"Hell hath no fury like a textbook scorned," retorted the Omitter of Nathan Hale. "I know what's the matter with you. You used to have everything your own way, and now you hear the younger generation knocking at the door."

Here a few—a very few—books of real authority which had by some mistake got into the Commissioner's office tried to interpose, and pointed out that the textbooks were behaving very foolishly on both sides. But it was too late. The shindy was on. The books with Nathan Hale chapters took them out and tried to brain the books which lacked them. The Friends of British Bravery at Bunker Hill sent their most poisoned arrows into the ranks of the Hundred-and-two Percenters. Between the Pros and Cons of Hancock flew dumdum bullets by the ton. Bindings cracked and covers flew. Torn pages filled the air. It was morning before victory perched upon the tattered banners of . . . (*deleted by the Censor*).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Injunction—A Weapon of Industrial Power

By ALBERT DE SILVER

A FEW weeks ago Albert B. Anderson, United States district judge, startled us by issuing an injunction against the attempts of the United Mine Workers to extend their organization to the coal mines of Mingo County, West Virginia. The judge took the view that unionization of the Mingo County mines, by forcing the adoption of the union wage scale and conditions, would tend to increase their labor costs and consequently decrease their competition with the unionized mines of the Central Competitive Field. This, he felt, would be a restraint of interstate trade prohibited by the Sherman Anti-Trust Law and he therefore enjoined it. Clearly the consequences of the legal doctrine involved in the decision were enormous. It meant that the ultimate aim of many nation-wide unions, 100 per cent unionization of the industry, was unlawful if the product was sold outside the State where it was produced. The very life almost of organized labor was at stake. The miners appealed, and the Circuit Court of Appeals has just handed down its decision which happily does not leave much of Judge Anderson's ruling. The only kind of an injunction, says the court, which the West Virginia operators are entitled to get is one prohibiting certain specific unlawful acts. The Mine Workers have a right to try to organize the West Virginia mines and the contention about the Anti-Trust Law has nothing to do with it.

One breathes easier. A new peril to industrial peace has been avoided, but the injunction has gone far and wide in labor cases in late years, and it may be useful to pause—and to ponder on its spread.

Ever since labor organizations began to gain in numbers and economic power there has been a constant effort on the part of employers to enlist the aid of the courts in their effort to resist the demands made upon them by the unions. First they tried to have combinations of workers declared to be criminal conspiracies, but fortunately this attempt failed. During the subsequent decades, while we were becoming an industrial nation, they steadily continued the search to find an effective weapon to use against the growing power of the workers' organizations. The theory that the activities of labor unions constitute an unlawful conspiracy was never wholly abandoned, and in the ten years between 1885 and 1895, when injunctions in labor disputes first began to be used, a new form of application for it was found.

The injunction itself is an old form of legal remedy applied by a court of equity on the theory that when unlawful conduct of one sort or another is about to accomplish injury which cannot be adequately compensated by money damages, the only form of effective remedy is to prevent the injury. The first injunctions in labor cases which attracted wide notice were issued by the Federal courts in 1888 and in the early nineties, during the railway strikes of that period, and were granted to prevent alleged violations of the Anti-Trust Law and the Interstate Commerce Act. These cases led the way and they were almost immediately followed by others in which the illegality of the strikers' conduct was construed to follow from threatened irreparable injury to the property rights of the employer. Indeed, in the case growing out of the threatened Northern Pacific Railroad strike of 1893-94, the U. S. District Court enjoined the strike on the ground that it was of itself unlawful, going so far as to say of strikes in general:

> The strike has become a serious evil, destructive of property, destructive of individual right, injurious to the conspirators themselves, and subversive to republican institutions. . . . It must ever remain the duty of the courts, in the protection of society, and in the execution of the laws of the land, to condemn, prevent, and punish all such unlawful conspiracies and combinations.

The Circuit Court of Appeals, however, fortunately reversed this extreme view, and since that time it has been settled law that a strike is not illegal unless it can be shown that it was for an unlawful purpose or that unlawful methods were used in connection with it.

There has, nevertheless, been a rapid growth of the use of injunctions in labor disputes. Broadly speaking, the activities of labor unions and their sympathizers which are continually being enjoined fall into two classes depending upon whether or not they are deemed to be unlawful in themselves. In the first of these are frequently found injunctions against the acts of violence and destruction of property which unhappily occur from time to time in the heat of a bitter strike. That such acts are properly subject to injunction no one will dispute, but it is a pity that the courts in dealing with them have not avoided the temptation of imputing responsibility to the entire organization involved in the dispute and not merely to the individuals guilty. In the strike against Michaels, Stern & Company, in Rochester, for example, the picket line at times got out of hand and there was some scuffling and fighting between pickets and strike-breakers. The court attributed this to the governing body of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and because of it held the entire strike to be an illegal conspiracy subject to injunction. On another theory in the Coronado Coal Company case, now before the Supreme Court on appeal, the national organization of the United Mine Workers has been held responsible for acts of violence committed by unknown persons during a strike conducted by local unions in Arkansas, and a judgment aggregating close to a million dollars in damages has been entered against the union.

Somewhat allied to injunctions against acts of violence are those directed against conduct amounting to intimidation either of strike-breakers or of workers who have not struck. It of course goes without saying that threats and intimidation are not proper, but the line between heated persuasion and intimidation is a shadowy one at best. Even peaceful picketing is held to be unlawful in New Jersey on the theory that it necessarily means intimidation, and the Supreme Court of the United States has just held that the strikers in a case before it were entitled to have only one picket at each entrance to the plant where the strike was in progress. The question is always a delicate one and, to a certain extent, depends upon the particular circumstances of each case.

In the decision of such questions the personal equation and opinions of the judge must of necessity play a considerable part, and it is not surprising that the results have been confusing. Occasionally a decision is handed down

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which shows how this state of the law opens the door to decision by judicial bias. Recently Mr. Justice Strong of the New York Supreme Court issued an injunction in a picketing case in Brooklyn, delivering with it an opinion which passed over the legal points involved in the application before him and devoted some thousands of words to a scathing and irrelevant denunciation of labor organizations and labor agents. It is small wonder in view of such opinions that many in the ranks of organized labor have come to feel that the cards are stacked against them when once their dispute comes into the courts.

While the law of industrial relations has been developing, there has grown up among a considerable number of employers (notably the West Virginia coal operators) the practice of having their men sign a contract of employment, providing among other things that they will not join a labor union. These contracts have been upheld, and the courts have from time to time enjoined any attempt to organize workers employed under them. Such an attempt was held to amount to soliciting a breach of contract and consequently unlawful. This view received the sanction of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Hitchman Coal and Coke Company *vs.* Mitchel and is being followed by an increasing number of State courts. The wisdom of such a decision may well be questioned because it strikes at the very existence of labor unions in that it gives to the employer power to prevent or destroy all organization of his men merely by the individual worker's assent to a clause in the employment contract. The policy involved has had its fullest test in West Virginia, and where it leads may be seen from the present state of guerrilla warfare which exists in the non-union counties of that State. Moreover, these cases are based on the familiar but unwarranted assumption that any contract of employment between an individual worker and a large employer of labor is free and untrammeled on both sides. As a matter of fact, the need of the job is generally sufficiently pressing to induce the worker to sign any sort of a printed form which is made a condition to obtaining it. To disregard this fact, as these cases do, looks all too much like flying in the face of present-day realities in industry.

From time to time the Federal courts have also issued injunctions against various activities of labor unions on the ground that they were about to violate some Federal statute—the Interstate Commerce Act, the Anti-Trust Law, the Lever Act, or the like. In most such cases the statutes relied upon have not primarily been intended to affect labor organizations, but, although Congress presumably had had some altogether different primary purpose in mind, these laws have been so construed that injunctions against organized labor have been based upon them. Such a case was the injunction against the coal strike in 1919. Such a case was the injunction against machinists' locals in the Duplex Printing Press Company case, where a refusal in New York to set up presses made in Michigan under non-union conditions was construed to restrain interstate commerce in violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. The Duplex case is all the more startling because of the provision of the Clayton Act that labor organizations should not "be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the Anti-Trust laws."

But besides the cases in which unions have been enjoined because the means which they have used have been held unlawful there has developed a body of decisions sustaining injunctions against union activities which in themselves offend against no provision of law. To refuse to work is an unquestioned right, but injunctions have been granted against a refusal to work on goods made under non-union conditions. Everyone has a right to decline to buy the goods of a particular merchant or manufacturer and to advise his friends to do the same, but boycotts have been enjoined and injunctions against the "We Don't Patronize" list published in labor newspapers are of common occurrence. We all are entitled freely to speak our opinions as to whether Mr. Jones or Mr. Smith is fair to organized labor, but if we belong to a union and are on strike and concertedly advertise our view of their unfairness we may find ourselves enjoined by the courts. This may seem strange—all the stranger, indeed, because the Supreme Court has sustained the employer's constitutional right to hire only non-union workers and therefore to blacklist union men. The explanation is at the same time simple and ingenious. The theory has been built up by judicial decisions that sometimes it is necessary to look farther than the mere character of the activities engaged in by labor unions. Sometimes it is necessary to inquire into their purpose as well, and if it be found that their purpose is unlawful—the union may be enjoined although the means which it adopted are in themselves quite proper. Thus, if the court holds that the primary purpose of a refusal to work on non-union goods is to accomplish malicious injury to the business of the manufacturer of those goods and not merely to benefit the members of the union, such a refusal may be restrained by injunction. This doctrine which makes malicious purpose the test in labor cases of this sort appears to have been clearly suggested for the first time in 1895 by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, then a U. S. circuit judge. Since that decision to the present day this doctrine has been repeatedly used. It is of course not to be understood that all union activities may be enjoined upon this theory or even that injunctions are always thus granted against the activities just mentioned. Even the secondary boycott, for example, is held to be lawful in some States, if confined within a particular industry. It is, however, true that the doctrine has been repeatedly used and that its use is growing.

Now, how does it work as a matter of practice? Unfortunately, but quite inevitably, the court all too often determines the existence or non-existence of malice according to its opinion of the propriety of the union's cause and of its tactics. If the interest of its members seems to justify what they did, malice will not be inferred. But if their actions appeal to the court as being remote from their well-being, it is likely that the union's purpose will be held to be malicious and it will be enjoined. By this it is not meant that it is the fault of the judge when injustice results in a given case, for the decision of industrial disputes should not be made to depend upon a judicial searching of other men's minds. But, unhappily the law has left the matter in this uncertain condition. As Professor Commons says, it has "actually meant that the court held the conduct of the working man to be lawful only when it sympathized with his demands."

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the law relating to injunctions in labor disputes varies widely in each State and that each case in any State stands alone and depends upon its own peculiar facts and circumstances. That a body of law upon such a vital matter as industrial relations has been permitted to grow up thus vague and ill defined and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so necessarily influenced by the personal point of view of the particular judge who administers it is well-nigh calamitous, for it has prevented the legal framework of our industrial relations from taking regular and solid shape. And this is not the only misfortune in the application of the injunction to the industrial struggle. As has been said before, the theory upon which it is used is that it prevents irreparable injury to the employer. In many cases doubtless this is true. But, true or false, it has the almost inevitable effect in every case of working irreparable injury to the union. An industrial dispute is in the last analysis a test of economic power between the employer and those who work for him. The worker has no reserve to tide him over a long period of unemployment. Hunger will not permit him to remain inactive for a long time while the employer operates his plant with strike-breakers, unembarrassed by the publicity and the economic pressure of strike activities and unhindered by the moral force of the picket line. These are the only weapons which the worker has and upon them the weapon of the injunction is frequently brought to bear. Once it has been issued it destroys or seriously impairs his economic power so far as that particular controversy is concerned, while it leaves to the employer substantially unimpaired all the means of exercising pressure which he had at the outset. The latter has been placed in a position of enormous advantage and almost invariably enabled to dictate the terms upon which the dispute is settled.

It has been said that only a peace between equals can last, and this is as sound in industry as in international affairs. As the industrial struggle in America is shaped today there is all too little equality between the contending forces. Three hundred thousand steel workers found themselves pitiably weak against the forces brought into play by the United States Steel Corporation. The mine workers in Alabama were utterly routed by the mine owners and the power of the State Government which was brought to bear against them. Approximate equality in power exists only in occasional and isolated industries. The injunction, if it continues to be used in labor disputes as it is now being used, will destroy what little semblance of equality there may be and, if it brings peace in industry at all, will bring only a dictated peace—a mere truce filled with bitterness and dissension while the contending forces prepare for the next test of power.

The Stock-Yards Strike

By BENJAMIN STOLBERG

THE packing industry quite literally uses the live stock 100 per cent. The only limitations upon its industrial ingenuity are set by the animal organism to be packed. But anyone who has worked in the Yards cannot but feel that this almost uncanny animal economy has been developed at the expense of human welfare.

During the last fifteen years unskilled labor in the Yards has been between 60 and 85 per cent Polish. The sudden transplantation of the Polish peasant from the anti-Semitic and poverty-stricken feudalism of his homeland to comparative political and social independence under tremendous economic exactitude does not render him good union material. Still, the indefatigable efforts of John Fitzpatrick and William Z. Foster, aided by John Kikulski, a Polish woodworker, got 40 to 45 per cent of the workers organized by December, 1917. Then the labor leaders tried to deal with the Big Five, whose answer had every appearance of an effort to precipitate a strike by which they hoped to win a decisive victory since the country was at the height of its war fever. And they would have won had not the Wilson Administration thrown its weight to the unions and prevailed upon the packers to intrust all industrial relations to an umpire, though the packers took precaution never to recognize, *de jure*, labor's right to organize. From March 16, 1917, to September 15, 1921, Judge Samuel Alschuler was sole administrator of industrial polity in the industry.

Through the war labor gained steadily. On the whole, its demands always kept equitably within the bounds of the minimum cost of living and humanitarian standard, and so could be granted under the sympathetic pressure of a public opinion startled by the revelations of the Federal Trade Commission about the business tactics of the five big packers. In 1914 common labor in the Yards was paid 17½ cents an hour. In January, 1918, the rate jumped to 27½ cents. Judge Alschuler's first decision of March 30, 1918, raised it to 32 cents. At the same time, he fixed a basic eight-hour day, beginning May 5, 1918, when the rate was heightened to 40 cents an hour. He also provided for time-and-a-half pay for overtime and holiday work. After this first award labor flocked to join the union and within two weeks it became about 98 per cent organized.

Toward the end of the summer of 1918 the packers realized that the war was likely to end soon, and they began to lay plans for the "reconstruction" of their industry. I shall concentrate on Swift and Company in describing this strategy for the defeat of unionism. I am singling out this firm from a desire to be fair to the social intelligence of the packers, because Swift and Company is by far the most progressive of them. The main reason is that Mr. Harold Swift, intelligent and well-wishing, came in his undergraduate days at the University of Chicago under the beneficent influence of Professors Henderson and Hoxie. It was Swift and Company who tried in 1920 to controvert by advertising in the daily and also in the liberal press the indictments of the Federal Trade Commission and the National Consumers' League. And so it was again Swift and Company who first engaged upon a truly comprehensive educational and industrial scheme.

But the most remarkable feature about this new department is its head. The welfare personnel in the other packing plants run true to type: clean cut, "coming," youngish executives; industrial Y men, healing industrial bruises with free medical attention and sweetening the life of the industrial army with chocolate at Americanization picnics. But John Calder, the manager of industrial relations at Swift's, is not John Mott. A man about sixty-five years old, a graduate of Glasgow University where he studied philosophy under the great Edward Caird, he later turned to mechanical and then to efficiency and social engineering. For years he had been in charge of big industry in Britain and for the last twenty-two years in America. His talk sounds sincere in its poised, well-informed intelligence,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slightly exhilarated by a fine Scotch humor. And his reactionary temper lacks all vindictiveness, but comes from the honest conviction that to deal with "unenlightened" unionism is a revolutionary step to be avoided, for labor can never hope to acquire the technical efficiency of management.

It was during armistice days that John Calder began his work of undoing unionism in the Yards. Of course, his department already had the conventional employment, medical, training, and welfare subdivisions. But now it bent its main energies on perfecting a new pension and benefit scheme, and at the present time Mr. Calder is working on an unemployment insurance policy. He also invigorated the employees stock investment plan and developed a training course for foremen, consummately skilful in its scientific simplicity. Over 3,000 foremen took the sixteen weeks' course in which the inherent harmony between capital and labor, as seen by capital, was pointed out. A similar course was introduced for the common help in the Chicago plant and is now being extended to the subsidiary plants all over the country. Thus John Calder carefully inoculated the germ of company unionism into the packing industry. In time this labor anti-toxin was injected by the other packers, excepting Morris and Company, who never were in business for their health and now again proposed to disregard industrial disease.

Between March 30, 1918, the date of the first Alschuler award, and February 21, 1921, when the packers suddenly notified the outgoing Wilson Administration that they considered themselves out of the Alschuler agreement, unskilled labor had been raised in successive advances to 53 cents an hour with proportional increases for skilled labor and for piecework. On March 6, 1921, two days after the entry of the Harding Administration, the packers announced a wage cut to 45 cents for common labor and 12½ per cent on piecework, to take effect March 14. They also proposed to change the basic eight-hour day to ten hours, with overtime pay for work beyond fifty-four hours a week. But under pressure from President Harding and his Secretary of Labor a temporary truce was signed in Washington in which labor abided by the 8 cents reduction, leaving all other matters to the Administrator, who was to continue in office until September 15, 1921.

In his decision of July 14, 1921, Judge Alschuler refused the packers' application for a further 5 cents hourly reduction. Thereupon Armour and Company announced their plan of "industrial democracy." Swift and Company followed. This Employees Representation Plan provides for an assembly composed of equal numbers of elected represensatives of employees and appointed representatives of the management. The three standing committees are: (a) On assembly procedure and elections, (b) on interpretations and for adjustment of disputed plant rulings, and (c) on changes in working conditions. Each plant has its own congress and a two-thirds vote on any issue is binding. The rules forbid election to employee representation of anyone who occupies a position of "trust" in the management, such as foremen, time-keepers, or watchmen. But somehow, in spite of secret balloting, practically all of the employees elected were men of well-known "loyalty" if not of "trust." Those returned to the Armour assembly especially were unpopular among the workers.

On August 15 the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America called a meeting of local representatives in Omaha. There the officers were instructed to ask the packers for a renewal of the agreement, which they did, meeting with a courteous but definite refusal. A strike ballot was then taken, 90 per cent voting in its favor. With this power to declare a strike, the executive committee of the Butcher Workmen called a meeting of the other unions in the industry, when it was decided to postpone the strike until the packers announced another wage reduction, so that the issue might be crystallized. Soon after, the Armour Company Union voted for the following reduction: those receiving 45 cents an hour were cut to 37½ cents; those receiving 45 to 50 cents were reduced 5 cents; those making over 50 cents were reduced 3 cents. For the moment the eight-hour day was kept. The other packers followed suit, so that when the Federal Administrator left his office on September 15, 1921, about 65 per cent of the workers in the packing industry were asked in the name of industrial democracy to support their families on $17.60 a week.

The packers could not possibly have chosen a more propitious moment to assault the union. Dennis Lane, secretary of the Butcher Workmen and their attorney, Brennan, admittedly committed a grave tactical error last March when they agreed to the 8-cent reduction outside the Alschuler agreement. Also, labor in the Yards is too shifting to weather the periodic factionalism of its leadership. And then, of course, the terror of unemployment is the best ally of the reaction.

The strike was called for December 5. Thereupon Morris and Company opened an employment office in the heart of the Negro section, thus introducing with incredible callousness the ever inflammable race issue, which did flare up in the murder of one colored man. Two thousand police, many of them mounted and on motorcycles, and all of them heavily armed, took charge of Packingtown with a flauntingly martial air. Captain William Russell, in charge of the Stockyard Station, gave the following interview to the Chicago *Daily News:* "The patrolmen have been instructed not to shoot unless necessary. They have been advised to use their clubs and fists freely. However, they have also been told that if the occasion should arise for shooting, they must shoot quickly and accurately. That policy has had excellent results already." Among these "excellent results" were one man mortally wounded and several seriously injured when the police fired straight into a crowd of both sexes and all ages after one of their number had been knocked unconscious by a motorcycle. It was this brazen human as well as constitutional disregard which stirred the entire strike region into a sense of moral outrage, breaking out into sporadic violence during the second, third, and fourth days of the strike.

Then Swift and Company got Judge Dennis Sullivan to issue his notorious injunction against labor, in which he declared that "in Illinois there is no such thing as peaceful picketing." And to complete the picture the metropolitan press featured the ludicrous version of the police that the outbreaks were fomented by red radicalism, while since quiet has been established it has ignored the strike altogether.

I was in the Yards on December 7 and 8. They were practically empty. On December 29 and 30 they showed, at least on the surface of things, normal activity. On the other hand, labor claims that the packers have concentrated all their efforts on the killing and shipping ends, neglecting the by-products altogether.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Hope for China?

By NATHANIEL PEFFER

Washington, January 15

I LIKE that line by a Baltimore correspondent who described the change in the current of Conference events as "Kid Hughes has caught his second wind." A little less accurate than picturesque, possibly, since it might be said by the meticulous of mind that there was scarcely reason for Mr. Hughes to have lost his first wind, but the very inaccuracy is unconscious recording of Conference psychology—or, better, Conference comedy.

It will not yet be forgotten that for eight weeks and two days was the voice of the American press raised to mingle with the American official voice in crying hosannas for diplomatic victory. Each day was proclaimed yet a new and more unparalleled success to be added to the other new and unparalleled successes of the Conference. Each day was China liberated anew and the peace of the Far East yet again made secure. And between the second day of the ninth week and the third day of the ninth week, that being last Monday, press and officialdom leaped up as one, crying Eureka! Together they had discovered that nothing had been done about the Far East and the Conference was about to adjourn.

Nothing had happened overnight and there was no more reason for seeing blue on the morn of that day than for having seen rainbow-pink at eve of the day before. From the very beginning there had been a voice here and there in the wilderness of jubilations crying that all was not well and nothing was being done. So far as officialdom was concerned there was no divine revelation. There was only plain mundane speaking from up the Hill, where already rumblings had been heard from afar, voices of the forces gathering in the distance for the onslaught and the sharpening of Democratic battle-axes to be laid on the necks of newly born and pious treaties. And Republican ears heard and Republican eyes opened—you see how devious are the ways of American diplomatic providence—and Mr. Hughes told Mr. Balfour that he wouldn't sail for England in five more days.

I feel most keenly for the 110,000,000 of the American public in their bewilderment. In their Sunday papers they had read of continued progress and the preliminaries to the end of a perfect Conference. In their Monday papers they read of the sad failings of a delinquent Conference. Well, it is time they knew their press. For eight weeks and two days the papers had reported a perfect Conference, because they had been told it was. On the next day they reported a delinquent Conference, because they had been told it was. The moral of which is that the difference between secret diplomacy and open diplomacy (the Washington, 1921, model open diplomacy) may be very little in results and not dependent exclusively on diplomats. It may be only the difference between no information and doctored information. That depends upon whether the agencies that circulate information to the public know whether it is real information or doctored information, or, knowing, care. In this country they do not. The press has one philosophy and one technique. The philosophy is: get the news, and whatever is officially or publicly said, whether true or half-true or false, is news. The technique is: parrot, and parrot in flocks. The first charge laid upon the reporter is the abdication of intelligence, and the critical faculty is anathema. I do not think I have ever seen that charge so successfully executed as here and now, and under such a glaring light and in such momentous circumstances.

Nevertheless, the Conference has taken a new lease on life and hope has lifted again its bludgeoned head. On first being convinced thereof, I laid out sackcloth, heaped up ashes, and prepared myself in spirit to make the nine kowtows in apology to Mr. Hughes and his fellow-delegates. For had I not already charged them with involuntary surrender and prematurely recorded defeat, and defeat by default, in what must have been America's aim at the Conference on Far Eastern questions? I had prepared myself for recantation. Now I think I shall wait. I may yet be shown to have been premature. I hope so. But I shall not make my prostrations yet.

For Mr. Hughes may have challenged anew, but his enemies rise once more to belabor him. It is told to us now officially, unofficially, and in the public prints that there must be a serious discussion of Far Eastern questions and a satisfactory disposition made of them. What are these questions? Shantung, of course; and with respect to that a genuine effort is being made for a solution. But it has not yet developed on which side, Japan or China, the more pressure is being put; and whether efforts are not being made for a compromise with a pleasant external aspect rather than one which shall do full justice to China. Also there are the Twenty-one Demands, Manchuria, economic concessions, discriminations in contravention of the Open Door, the future of leased territories and territorial concessions. Now, if it be the intention seriously to discuss these questions, the mood for departure in visiting delegates must be dispelled at once, for they cannot be so discussed in less than a month. Nor can they be discussed to successful issue unless, first—as I have written before—Great Britain is convinced that it must accept the American conception of the Powers' relation to China, which means to reverse its past policy; and, second, unless Great Britain is brought to align itself positively and decisively with America to compel Japan to yield part of its gains from past aggressions in China and to moderate its future ambitions in China. Only by the threat of isolation can Japan be driven to do so.

What evidence is there of any British intentions in that direction? None. To the contrary, quite to the contrary, for all the benisons that are being breathed on Anglo-American solidarity at this Conference. The British have employed again in the last week their skilful tactics of advance sabotage by publicity. The Twenty-one Demands? Two British delegates have said publicly that there is nothing to discuss, for is not China a sovereign Power and are not treaties signed by sovereign Powers valid? (Even if the sovereign Power declares they are not.) Manchuria? The same. Discrimination nullifying the Open Door principle? There is no proof, say the British. Siberia? Really, they did not know what the Siberian question was and Great Britain had no interests in Siberia at all. Thus again the British delegation forestalls American action before America has even spoken its intention; it again declares itself and again publicly arrays itself, if not with Japan then at least as neutral, that being adequate notification to Japan that it need not recede by a step. And Mr. Hughes again has failed to take up the challenge or even to reply.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Diary of Sir Roger Casement*

CHAPTER IX

Berlin, 11 February, 1915

NEARLY two weeks since I wrote in my Diary—and in many respects the most eventful since I left U. S. A. full of anxiety, grave disquiet, and overwhelming doubt at times. I came out yesterday afternoon from the Continental Hotel where I had been for eight days to this sanitarium in the Grunewald to be quiet and away from press reporters. I have still a day of quiet before the newspaper war begins, and now that a little peace of mind is returning to me—although slowly—I will try briefly to record events since the last entry, dating them when I can recall the dates.

24 January

Meyer came to lunch with me (and tried to pay for it although my guest!). We went (with Adler) to the General Staff of the Admiralty where I saw first Admiral Behncke and then Captain Isendahl and the other captain, whose name I forget. Adler told them the whole Findlay story to their intense amusement. They asked to see the guaranty and Meyer said *"Impossible to take it out of the F. O. as it is a State Document"*—this in my hearing, but in German; Adler told me of it and looked at me as it was being said! Nothing decided there as to my return to Norway. They will let me know. I told von Wedel yesterday that the Findlay letter was mine and I should use it quickly against the British Government, not against Findlay, their poor agent. He hummed and deprecated haste—but could offer no real objection—and had to say "Of course, Sir Roger, the letter is yours when you need it." I was more and more uncertain how to act about Findlay. With the Germans silently stealing the letter and practically saying to me "You can use this only as we choose" my hands were tied. However, I decided to write my letter to Grey. This I had begun in Limburg on the 12th January, but had been forced to keep over until I was aware of the end of the Mjölnir incident.

25 January

Lay at 2:30 in the big hall of the hotel. I told him I wanted advice and a notarial act performed by him as consul, viz., to copy a document I should produce and article to it. He was most uneasy and said he would let me know—and suggested the Ambassador, etc. I told him it was purely a notarial act of the consulate; I wanted a certificate of a certain document having been brought by me and copied by him as consul. He promised to let me know if he could do it. I said I could only tell him the nature of the document when I was sure he could perform the service—and so there it stayed for the time.

26 January

Still in doubt how to act. My wish is to write Grey, renouncing all honors, recounting his crime, and go to Norway to send the letter thence and challenge investigation on the spot. Began writing the final form of my letter to Grey, but only a draft of what I *think* of saying.

28 January

Writing my letter to Grey all day nearly and discussing things with Blücher—who is very angry at the Foreign Office business here over the letter and says he will tell von Jagow. I went to F. O. at 6:30 and saw von Wedel and told him I had made up my mind to write Grey fully and to go to Christiania. He agreed. I said I should send the letter ahead by Adler probably and follow as soon as I could and fight the matter out in Christiania. Essential, I pointed out, to act quickly, as when the London Parliament assembles on February 2 there will be questions about me and then, if the F. O. there know they have failed to catch me, they will make a fine show of moral indignation against my "treason" and take some overt step. I want to be first in the field and *expose them*—before they get the ear of the world.

29 January

Got the Esplanade typist to type three copies of my letter to Grey—finished.

SIR ROGER'S OPEN LETTER TO SIR EDWARD GREY

SIR: I observe that some discussion has taken place in the House of Lords on the subject of the pension I voluntarily ceased to draw when I set out to learn what might be the intentions of the German Government in regard to Ireland. In the course of that discussion I understand Lord Crewe observed that "Sir Roger Casement's action merited a sensible punishment."

The question raised thus as to my action and your publicly suggested punishment of it I propose discussing here and now, since the final proof of the actual punishment you sought in secret to inflict upon me is, at length, in my possession. It is true I was aware of your intentions from the first day I set foot in Norway three months ago; but it has taken time to compel your agent there to furnish the written proof of the conspiracy then set on foot against me by His Majesty's Government.

Let me first briefly define my action before proceeding to contrast it with your own.

The question between the British Government and myself has never been, as you are fully aware, a matter of a pension, of a reward, a decoration. I served the British Government faithfully and loyally as long as it was possible for me to do so, and when it became impossible I resigned. When, later, it became impossible for me to use the pension assigned me by law I voluntarily abandoned that income as I had previously resigned the post from which it was derived, and as I now proceed to divest myself of the honors and distinctions that at various times have been conferred upon me by His Majesty's Government.

I came to Europe from the United States last October in order to make sure that whatever might be the course of this war, my own country, Ireland, should suffer from it the minimum of harm. The view I held was made sufficiently clear in an open letter I wrote on the 17th September last in New York, and sent to Ireland for public distribution among my countrymen. I append a printed copy of that letter. It defines my personal standpoint clearly enough and expresses the views I held, and hold, on an Irishman's duty to his country in this crisis of world affairs. Soon after writing that letter I set out for Europe. To save Ireland from some of the calamities of war was worth the loss to myself of pension and honors and was even worth the commission of an act of technical "treason."

I decided to take all the risks and to accept all the penalties the law might attach to my action. I did not, however, bargain for risks and penalties that lay outside the law as far as my own action lay outside the field of moral turpitude. In other words, while I reckoned with British law and legal penalties and accepted the sacrifice of income, position, and reputation as prices I must pay, I did not reckon with the British Government. I

* Copyright, 1922, by Charles E. Curry. All rights reserved. The first instalment appeared in *The Nation* of November 30, 1921.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was prepared to face charges in a court of law; I was not prepared to meet waylaying, kidnapping, suborning of dependents, or "knocking on the head"—in fine, all the expedients your representative in a neutral country invoked when he became aware of my presence there.

For the criminal conspiracy that Mr. M. de C. Findlay, H. B. M. Minister to the Court of Norway, entered into on the 30th October last, in the British Legation at Christiania, with the Norwegian subject, my dependent, Eivind Adler Christensen, involved all these things and more. It involved not merely a lawless attack upon myself, for which the British Minister promised my follower the sum of £5,000, but it involved a breach of international law as well as of common law, for which the British Minister in Norway promised this Norwegian subject full immunity. . . .

[A part of the letter, dealing with Findlay and Christensen, is omitted at this point, as the story has been told in previous pages of the Diary.]

The rest of the story need not take so long in the telling. You are fully aware of most of the details, as you were in constant touch with your agent both by cable and dispatch. You are also aware of the declaration of the Imperial German Government, issued on the 20th November last in reply to the inquiry I addressed to them. The British Government, both by press reports and by direct agents, had charged Germany, throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, with the commission of atrocious crimes in Belgium and had warned the Irish people that their fate would be the same did Germany win this war. Your Government sought to frighten Irishmen into a predatory raid upon a people who had never injured them and to persuade them by false charges that this was their duty.

I sought not only a guaranty of German good-will to Ireland, but to relieve my countrymen from the apprehensions this campaign of calumny was designed to provoke and, so far as was possible, to dissuade them from embarking in an immoral conflict against a people who had never wronged Ireland. That Declaration of the German Government, issued as I know in all sincerity, is the justification for my "treason." The justification of the conspiracy of the British Government and its Minister at Christiania, begun before I had set foot on German soil, in a country where I had a perfect right to be, and conducted by means of the lowest forms of attempted bribery and corruption I leave you, Sir, to discover.

You will not discover it in the many interviews Mr. Findlay had, during the months of November and December last, at his own seeking, with my faithful follower. The correspondence between them in the cipher the Minister had arranged tells its own story. These interviews furnished matter that in due course I shall make public. What passed between your agent and mine on these occasions you are fully aware of, for you were the directing power throughout the whole proceeding. Your object, as Mr. Findlay frankly avowed to the man he thought he had bought, was to take my life with public indignity—mine was to expose your design and to do so through the very agent you had yourselves singled out for the purpose and had sought to corrupt to an act of singular infamy.

On one occasion, in response to my follower's pretended dissatisfaction with the amount offered for betraying me, you authorized your agent to increase the sum to £10,000. I have full record of the conversations held and of the pledges proffered in your name. On two occasions, during these prolonged bargainings, your Minister gave Adler Christensen gifts of "earnest money." Once it was five hundred crowns in Norwegian currency; the next time a similar sum, partly in Norwegian money and partly in English gold. On one of these occasions, to be precise on the 7th December last, Mr. Findlay handed Adler Christensen the key of the back entrance of the British Legation, so that he might go and come unobserved and at all hours. I propose returning this key in person to the donor, and along with it the various sums so anxiously bestowed upon my follower.

The stories told Mr. Findlay at these interviews should not have deceived a schoolboy. All the pretended evidence of my plans and intentions Adler Christensen produced, the bogus letters, fictitious maps and charts, and other incitements to Mr. Findlay's appetite for the incredible were part of my necessary plan of self-defense to lay bare the conspiracy you were engaged in and to secure that convincing proof of it I now hold.

It was not until the 3d ultimo that Mr. Findlay committed himself to give my protector the duly signed and formal pledge of reward and immunity, in the name of the British Government, for the crime he was being instigated to commit that is now in my possession. I transmit you herewith a photograph of this document.

At a date compatible with my own security against the clandestine guaranties and immunities of the British Minister in Norway I shall proceed to lay before the legitimate authorities in that country the original document and the evidence in my possession that throws light on the proceedings of His Majesty's Government. To that Government, through you, Sir, I now beg to return the insignia of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, the Coronation Medal of His Majesty King George V, and any other medal, honor, or distinction conferred upon me by His Majesty's Government, of which it is possible for me to divest myself.

I am, Sir,
Your most obedient humble servant,
(sgd) ROGER CASEMENT.

[*To be continued*]

Disputed Tread

By HAZEL HALL

Where she steps a whir,
Like dust about her feet,
Follows after her
Down the dustless street.

Something struggles there—
The forces that contend
Violently as to where
Her pathway is to end.

Issues, like great hands, grip
And wrestle for her tread;
One would strive to trip,
And one would goad ahead.

Conflicting strengths in her
Grapple to guide her feet,
Raising an unclean whir
Like dust upon the street.

Contributors to This Issue

ALBERT DE SILVER is a New York lawyer and the associate director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

BENJAMIN STOLBERG, formerly professor of sociology in the University of Oklahoma, is director of vocational guidance in the Chicago high schools.

KATHARINE ANTHONY is the author of "Margaret Fuller: A Psychological Biography."

WALTER F. WHITE is assistant secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The other contributors are known to our readers by frequent previous writings in these columns.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Man Who Carried the Message to Garcia

By ARNOLD MULDER

THERE came to my desk today from the Roycrofters a copy of the famous Message to Garcia. Though it was written twenty-two years ago and although over forty million copies have been printed—"a larger circulation than any other literary venture has ever attained during the life-time of the author, in all history" (this was written by Fra Elbertus in 1913; perhaps there has been an additional circulation of forty million since then)—it so happens that I had never read it.

I read A Message to Garcia through. Nearly all my life long I had known the name Garcia. The forty million copies of the Message had taken care of that. Like perhaps millions of others, I have frequently polished off a simile with "like the man who carried the message to Garcia." But today for the first time I learned that fellow's name.

It is Rowan.

I don't know yet what his initials may have been, or are—I don't know whether he is dead or alive. About General Garcia, Fra Elbertus tells us that he is dead, but about Rowan nothing. I don't believe the Fra himself knew what Rowan's first name was. He calls him "a fellow by the name of Rowan," and in the next paragraph he indulges in rhapsody: "By the Eternal! there is a man whose form should be cast in deathless bronze and the statue placed in every college of the land."

But was it so placed?

It was not.

Did this "fellow by the name of Rowan" win the world's applause? He did not. It was Garcia, who had nothing to do with the episode except receive the message, who got the advertising in five times forty million minds and probably five times forty million more.

Fra Elbertus naively declares that in all walks of life the man who carries the message to Garcia shall not lack for his reward. Hear the closing sentences of the famous preachment: "Civilization is one long, anxious search for just such individuals. Anything such a man asks shall be granted. He is wanted in every city, town, and village—in every office, shop, store, and factory. The world cries out for such: he is needed and needed badly—the man who can 'Carry a Message to Garcia.'"

Yes, the world cries for him, and then after he has carried his message, does the world cast his form in deathless bronze? By the Eternal, no! The world calls him "a fellow by the name of Rowan" and someone who has had nothing to do with it but wait gets the glory.

Forty million copies distributed by employers among their men to encourage them all to become carriers of a message to Garcia, and all the time this bit of unintentional irony sticking out of the pamphlet like a sore thumb! Is there no sense of humor in business? Presumably there is in the class from which "a fellow by the name of Rowan" came and for which the forty million pamphlets were printed, for it is not noticeable that there are more fellows by the name of Rowan today than there were in 1899.

Does A Message to Garcia inspire you to become "a fellow by the name of Rowan"? It had the reverse effect on me.

In the Driftway

DEPARTING from his well-established principle of getting from one place to another by walking only, the Drifter recently exchanged a nickel for a pink ticket which entitled him to a seat on the elevated railroad. He did not get the seat, of course, but entertainment was not lacking. The train jolted into a station and a slight old gentleman boarded it and grasped a strap to which he clung insecurely. Presently he got tired of standing and in a high, thin voice begged the occupants of the seat in front of him to squeeze over and make room for him. There was no room, but an amiable colored boy cheerfully relinquished his seat and the old gentleman sat down, beaming impartially on the other passengers. All seemed to be well. The old gentleman, however, was not still for long. His eye lit on a young woman dangling by three fingers in a manner learned from her more remote ancestors. He struggled to his feet and made as good a bow as the jerking train would allow. "Take my seat, my dear," he said gallantly. "Yes, you must take it! We must show these young men what it means to be polite." In vain the young woman protested her complete ability to stand, in vain she dwelt on her fondness for an upright posture in the early morning and her reluctance to part from her strap. The old gentleman pushed her gently into his vacant seat and swayed on his feet as precariously as before. The result, of course, was that another young man offered him a seat. And again the old gentleman made his sacrifice to helpless femininity. Three times he arose; three times other men rose; three women sat, and so each time did he. It began to look like a new version of "Going to Jerusalem" with the old gentleman always winning. The Drifter left the train with more regret than he had ever experienced in leaving a public conveyance. And what the effect was on the politeness of the younger male generation he was unable to ascertain.

* * * * *

ANATOLE FRANCE'S brief reply when the Nobel prize was awarded him at Stockholm has come the Drifter's way.

I have had it at heart to see, in the evening of my life, your fair country where the soil nourishes strong men and beautiful women. I have come with gratitude to receive this prize which crowns my literary life. I count as an unequaled honor this prize founded by a man of generous spirit and awarded with equity and competence by just judges.

When, as a member of the French Academy, I was called on to make suggestions for your choice, I agreed in advance with the distinctions which you awarded to Maeterlinck, who combines with a very rich style independent thought; to Romain Rolland, in whom you recognized a friend of justice and of peace, and who braved unpopularity to remain an honest man. I would be incompetent to speak of the Peace Prize awarded by the Norwegian Storthing, but perhaps I may be permitted to add my tribute to its most recent choice and to rejoice at seeing crowned a statesman of courage, Branting.

May such men conduct the affairs of mankind. The most horrible of wars has been followed by a treaty which was not a treaty of peace but a prolongation of the war. Europe will die of it if reason does not at last enter into her councils. If one may not reasonably hope for the triumph of peace and of harmony in the states of Europe, one may at least dare believe, gentlemen, that under the influence of such just and loyal spirits as yours, the good will sometimes have its revenge.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

A Note of Appreciation

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On behalf of the American Friends Service Committee I want to express to the editors and staff of *The Nation* our deep appreciation of the splendid support which *The Nation* has been giving to the question of relief and reconstruction which has interested us during this past year. Your leadership has been invaluable. You have stood for an open mind and the firm handling of the world's problems.

I trust that during this year and for many years to come you will continue to be an ever increasing factor in shaping public opinion in regard to things worth while.

Philadelphia, January 5 WILBUR K. THOMAS,
Executive Secretary,
American Friends Service Committee

The Great Bolshevist Conspiracy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In going over the recent numbers of *Le Progrès Civique* I was delightfully surprised with an article giving the solution of the great Communist conspiracy in France last winter, featuring a certain Zalewski-Abramowitch, who was supposed to be known all over Europe as the "eye of Moscow." He had introduced himself into France by surreptitious means, and, according to the Paris police, had distributed fabulous sums of bolshevist gold among the Communist leaders of France in the aim of fomenting a bloody soviet revolution. Inasmuch as the French Socialists had just declared their allegiance to the Third Internationale the story sounded plausible. Moreover the police furnished proof of their assertions by arresting several Communists, including the managing editor of *l'Humanité*, who had cashed Zalewski's checks at the American Express Company. The tale was spread, and the newspapers generally printed it without reserve, that 14,000,000 francs had been spent by Lenin and Trotzky for the dictatorship of the proletariat in France.

An exhaustive investigation of soviet funds introduced into France was begun by one of the bureaus of the Parquet, but no sooner was this done than the newspapers shut up about the matter. In the meantime a previous conspiracy involving prisoners arrested after the May-Day strikes of 1920 came to trial, and resulted in the acquittal of the Communists and a written recommendation by the jury that a law be passed guaranteeing freedom of opinion. After this setback the Government decided to release the Communists implicated in the second *complot*.

It turns out now that the recipients of bolshevist money in France were more numerous than rumor supposed. The police stopped their investigation because it was reaching men "higher up." The total amount of Russian money spent in France was not 14,000,000 but over 300,000,000 francs. Of this sum only 165,000 francs went to Communist propaganda. The rest went into good bourgeois hands to pay for goods or for services in financing the Russian Government's trade with Europe and America.

Considering the fuss that the French police made about a little matter of a $10,000 subsidy for radical agitation, it may be well to point out that, besides the semi-official French newspapers and reviews in the Rhineland, the Quai d'Orsay is responsible for the *Journal de Pologne*, published in Warsaw, the *Journal de Prague*, and the *Revue de Hongrie*. And so solicitous is the Government of France for the enlightenment of the Central European peoples that it self-sacrificingly neglects the education of its own. The laboratories in the Collège de France are crippled for lack of funds, and the stairways to these laboratories at one time this year reached such a state of dilapidation as to constitute a menace to life and limb.

In making these observations on the conduct of the French Government I must put liberals on guard against unconsciously transferring their hatred for certain policies of the Government of France upon the heads of the French people. A tendency of this sort has been noticeable in America since the Versailles treaty, much to the regret of sincere friends of France.

New York, November 25 BENJAMIN GINZBURG

"Social Equality" and the Negro

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I agree with your opinion of Mr. Harding's speech on the Negro question, both as to its merits and its defects. I think it is beyond the province of a President to advocate race-separatism within the citizenry which has elected him. Veil it verbally as one may, racial separatism inside a nation whose territory is a geographical unit works toward caste distinction, one caste claiming superiority over another. Moreover, is it well for any human group to repel any other from its association, without regard to individual character, personal behavior, or mental equipment? It is time to face squarely this question of so-called "social equality"—time to let the world (and its presidents) know that there are white Americans who are determined to do what they can to unite socially all the diverse racial elements in this country. We make no apologies for our action. We invite into our own parlors and visit in theirs whomsoever we find agreeable. We are thereby pleasing ourselves and we believe that we are promoting the welfare of America.

What does Mr. Harding mean by declaring "amalgamation" of the races to be "impossible"? There are now many millions of persons in this hemisphere whose existence is due to "amalgamation." The fact that this mixture is largely the result of illicit relationship proves, mainly, that the natural impulse toward mingling is too strong to be repressed by social or legal prohibition. Law and custom can only guide and regulate it. At present, all the world over, the white man seeks the dark woman by demoralizing and brutal methods vastly more than the dark man seeks the white woman in any way. It is the opinion of many close students of the situation that the imposition of arbitrary obstacles to legal union offers such large opportunity for and temptation to illicit connection that it promotes a more frequent and less desirable miscegenation than would occur were no barrier of law or custom erected between the races. The assertion that African and white race-mixture produces an inferior human stock is not warranted by the facts. Illegitimacy, however, does surround childhood with a degrading environment. American children are entitled to legitimate birth and the possession of openly avowed fathers.

Albion, R. I., December 19 LILLIE BUFFUM CHACE WYMAN

War and the People

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the critique of Corinne Roosevelt Robinson's eulogy of her distinguished brother reference is made to the analogy which his mind formulated between the peace of the frontier town where everybody "toted a gun" and the peace of the world maintained by universal but disparate preparedness. Such a deduction could only arise from that superficial thinking which formed so large and durable an element in Colonel Roosevelt's popularity. The obvious difference between the two situations is that in the former case the man who starts trouble risks his own life, while in the latter the determination of peace or war rests with men who rarely suffer even physical discomforts and who sometimes are directly benefited financially.

As this seems to be a sort of open season for suggesting methods of maintaining peace, let me offer mine. Let a con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitutional amendment be adopted ordaining that immediately upon a declaration of war the two houses of Congress shall meet jointly and elect a dictator. (As we get one anyhow, but usually not a man chosen for that sort of job, this proposal should not shock the most ardent republican.) The only limitation imposed on the choice to be that the person chosen shall not be any official then holding office by election of the people. Following the selection of the dictator, all Federal offices should be declared vacant and all elected executive officials, members of the Cabinet, and members of Congress, without reference to their physical or mental condition, be given the supreme honor of being placed in the front line of shock troops, that they may share in the consequences of their policy.

New York, January 10 J. J. M.

In Criticism of Garvey

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I desire to protest against Mr. Pickens's praise of the Garvey movement in your issue of December 28. Had Mr. Pickens read the report of the U. N. I. A., published in the *Negro World* for August 13, 1921, and my analysis of it in the *Crusader Magazine* for October, he would have learned: that the Liberian Construction Loan for which $144,000 was raised was used not to do construction work in Liberia but to reinforce Mr. Garvey's tottering businesses in New York; that the general membership of the U. N. I. A. is less than 100,000 and its financial membership less than 20,000; that according to uncontradicted newspaper reports the Yarmouth was seized by its original or real owners as far back as July; that the Kanawha has been tied up in Cuba for nearly six months; and that the Shady Side is out of commission. Mr. Garvey alleges that most of his assistants are or have been dishonest and Mr. Pickens repeats it in parrot-like fashion. If this is true, why were not these defalcations shown in the financial report and balance sheet already referred to? And why has not a single ex-officer of the Garvey outfit been convicted for embezzling the funds of any of his many enterprises?

What intelligent Negroes want Mr. Garvey to do is this: let him publish in the *Negro World* a properly audited (by certified accountants) financial statement of the U. N. I. A., parent body and New York branch, the Black Star Line, the Negro Factories Corporation, the African Redemption Fund, the African Communities League, the Liberian Construction Loan, etc., etc.

New York, December 30 W. A. Domingo

The Expert Revealed

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I would like to add, by way of an appendix to Mr. Villard's article on The Conference and Its Experts, the following definition:

Expert: A person qualified to deduce from *any* state of facts, arguments adequate to sustain a preconceived hypothesis, in the minds of the ill-informed.

New York, December 30 John J. Murphy

A New Pacific Problem

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I regret very much to inform you that in view of the fact that Mr. —— ——, Prop. of the Merchants' Cafe has ceased to exist, that is to say, died on the 18th of September last, sorry to state that having no power enough to act over his private affairs, I beg to hereby request that his subscription on your valuable and important newspaper or review be suspended or discontinued and greatly oblige.

Manila, P. I., November 8 J. S. R.

Books

The Roving Critic

HERE are some passages from an autobiographical sketch given me by a young and quite unknown poet whose career I think one of the most interesting I have heard about in a long time. Pascal D'Angelo was born, he says, "near the old walled city of Sulmona, Italy. It is a small town in the beautiful valley that was once the stronghold of the Samnites, walled in by the great blue barrens of Monte Majella. Few roads run to this quiet land and ancient traditions have never entirely died out there. Below the town is the garden of Ovid with its wild roses and cool springs, and above is an ancient castle that in summer is fantastically crowned with the mingling flight of pigeons which take care of their young on its towered heights. In the valley below are finely cultivated fields dotted with the ruins of Italica, the capital of fierce Samnium." There he went to school a very little during his childhood, handicapped by the fact that his parents at home could neither read nor write and that, because of their poverty, he was frequently obliged to stay at home to herd the family's six or seven sheep and four goats. At sixteen he came with his father and a number of fellow-villagers to the United States.

"In this country immigrants from the same town stick together like a swarm of bees from the same hive and work where the foreman, or 'boss,' finds a job for the gang. At first I was water-boy and then shortly after I took my place beside my father. I always was, and am, a pick-and-shovel man." Pascal D'Angelo worked here and there at similar rough labor, in New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, West Virginia, Maryland—at first unable to read newspapers printed in English and unaware that there were any printed in Italian. But gradually he learned to read, and always he was a poet. "When night comes and we all quit work the thud of the pick and the jingling of the shovel are not heard any more. All my day's labors are gone, forever. But if I write a line of poetry my work is not lost, my line is still there—it can be read by you today and can be read by another tomorrow. But my pick-and-shovel works can be read neither by you today nor by another tomorrow. . . . So I yearn for an opportunity to see what I can accomplish . . . before suffering, cold, wet, and rheumatism begin to harm me in the not distant future."

The finest lyric of his which I have seen thus gives a picture of the world in which he then moved:

"In the dark verdure of summer
The railroad tracks are like the chords of a lyre gleaming across
the dreamy valley,
And the road crosses them like a flash of lightning.

But the souls of many who speed like music on the melodious
heart-strings of the valley
Are dim with storms.
And the soul of a farm lad who plods, whistling, on the lightning
road
Is a bright blue sky."

As the result of being taken by a bar-tender to an Italian vaudeville show on the Bowery, the boy began to write—a farce, jokes, anecdotes "of the type for my class of people." Then he bought a small Webster's dictionary for a quarter and set out to master it. His companions laughed at him, but he persisted tirelessly. "I made them understand by spelling each word or writing it on a railroad tie or a piece of wood anywhere, just to express myself." As his ardor and his reputation grew some young brakemen undertook to discipline him. "What they did was to bring new words every morning. They used to come half an hour before working time and ask me the meaning of the new words. If I could answer the first word all was well and good; then they were quiet all day. If not, when noon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came all the office people, both men and women, crowded the place where everybody was present and tried to show me up. But their trials and efforts were all useless, as useless as I could make them. But one day they brought me before all the crowd, just to have me ridiculed perhaps, because they all were high-school lads. So they brought five words of which I knew only three. Then they began to proclaim themselves victorious. But I gave them two words they did not understand. Then I bet them I could give them ten words, and two more for good measure, that they could not understand. And I began: 'troglodyte, sebaceous, wen, passerine, indeciduity, murine, bantling, ubiquity, clithrophobia, nadir'; and instead of two I added seven more to make their debacle more horrible. So I again wrote seven more words with the chalk which they provided me, writing them against the office façade where every one could see their eternal defeat: 'anorexia, caballine, phlebotomy, coeval, arable, octoroon, risible.' Then to complete I added 'asininity' and explained its meaning to them immediately. . . . After that triumph they named me 'Solution' and all became friends."

Later he went to Sheepshead Bay to hear "Aida" in the open air. "Suddenly when I heard the music I began to feel myself driven toward a goal—a goal that became more and more distinct each day. There were parts of such eloquent beauty in that opera that they tore my soul. At times, afterwards, even on the job amid the confusion of running engines, cars, screams, thuds, I felt the supreme charms of the melodies around me." But he could not compose music, for he did not know one note from another—"as I still don't know. . . . Music is not like the English language, that I began to write without a teacher. . . . In poetry I fared better. In the library I wandered upon Shelley and was again thrilled to the heart. Shelley I could proceed to emulate almost immediately. . . . It was a hard job to put my words in order. The stuff I used to write at first was unthinkable trash. But I was always bothering people to point out my mistakes. Grammar gave me plenty of troubles and still does. Rhyme stumped me. Then I began to read all kinds of poetry and saw that rhyme was not absolutely necessary. I also discovered that a good deal of what is called poetry is junk. So from the first I have tried to avoid echoing the things I have read, and to bring an originality both of expression and thought."

Pascal D'Angelo has taught himself French and Spanish and has read most of the best poets of those tongues as well as of English and Italian. At present he is living under the most desperate conditions, staying in bed half of the day to keep warm in his unheated room, eating nothing but bananas, milk, and stale bread, asking no favors, and writing poetry which, though much of it is naturally full of imperfections, occasionally strikes such notes as these in The City:

"We who were born through the love of God must die through
the hatred of Man.
We who grapple with the destruction of ignorance and the
creation of unwitting love—
We struggle, blinded by dismal night in a weird shadowy city.
Yet the city itself is lifting street-lamps, like a million cups
filled with light,
To quench from the upraised eyes their thirst of gloom;
And from the hecatombs of aching souls
The factory smoke is unfolding in protesting curves
Like phantoms of black unappeased desires, yearning and struggling and pointing upward;
While through its dark streets pass people, tired, useless,
Trampling the vague black illusions
That pave their paths like broad leaves of water-lilies
On twilight streams;
And there are smiles at times on their lips.
Only the great soul, denuded to the blasts of reality,
Shivers and groans.
And like two wild ideas lost in a forest of thoughts,
Blind hatred and blinder love run amuck through the city."

CARL VAN DOREN

Remy de Gourmont

Decadence and Other Essays on the Culture of Ideas. By Remy de Gourmont. Authorized Translation by William Aspinwall Bradley. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

REMY DE GOURMONT took all knowledge to be his province. In an age of timid specialists he aimed after universality and achieved his aim less by virtue of his learning, vast as that was, than by virtue of that power and flexibility of mind which grasped the salient, penetrated to the core of every matter, unswathed every question to its ultimate nakedness. Despite his charming novels and vibrant verses he was primarily a critic. But he was a critic in a sense not often attached to the word among us. He was no mere appraiser of literary values, though he was that too. He pursued every value, a word that he used in the Nietzschean sense, to its ultimate source in the history of civilization and the psychology and physiology of man. Thus his criticism, whatever he discusses, is always an implicit universal philosophy, and from his dealing with the smallest poet he goes forth to the ends of the earth and of time and to unplumbed depths in the human consciousness.

He rose to his preeminence among contemporaries not strikingly inferior in talent, in sensibility, or even perhaps in learning, through the clean rectitude of his intelligence. There are many liberal minds in the world, and that is supposed to mean, in the broadest and finest sense, free minds. But the pathetic fact is that most of these minds put a limit to their own freedom and at some point in the process of thought, and especially in certain directions, raise a sudden wall built of their likes and prejudices and inhibitions and ancestral fears. Without warning, they will establish distinctions in one field which they have just disallowed in another. Clear-visioned in politics, they will grow violent mystics when discussing love; liberals in religion, they will grovel before the idol of the state. Remy de Gourmont's mind was incapable of such yieldings and corruptions. And so, naturally, many people have called it and will call it again a corrosive mind, thus illustrating his own description of that mythopoeic association of ideas without necessary connection which does duty for thinking in the marketplaces of the world. His mind burned, it is true. But it burned not like an acid which corrodes gold but like the fire which cleanses it of dross. And even while one makes that distinction one is aware of the pseudo-liberal's probable use of it—declaring suddenly that combustibility does not necessarily show a thing to be dross and that Gourmont was devoid of decency and reverence, the two words commonly used when the emotions desire to be screened from the operations of the intellect.

Gourmont's central position, illustrated in a score of volumes and in a dozen fields, is set forth in The Disassociation of Ideas, the opening paper in the admirable volume of selections before us. Most "truths" which travel the world are "associations of ideas common to a large number of men, none of whom would dare deliberately to disassociate them." But the search for truth or, at least, the effort to eliminate those errors which confuse mankind and are actually threatening it with destruction, must take the form of disassociating these ideas which were originally associated not because there was a necessary connection between them, but because that particular association fell in with the pleasure and interest of primitive-minded men, and, one may add, often enough, perhaps generally, not even with their real pleasure and interest but with dark rites and propitiatory actions which experience, interpreted in the light of myth and not of reason, seemed to dictate. Hence, the first duty of the free mind is to examine the current "truths" and analyze them. The test is simple. "A truth is dead when it has been shown that the relations between the elements are habitual and not necessary." To these analyses Gourmont was led by his recognition of the relativity of reality itself which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he shares with Anatole France and derives, like his great contemporary, from the doctrines of German idealism as they find their embodiment in Schopenhauer.

We may seem so far not to be describing a literary critic or a man of letters at all. The truth is, of course, that most literary criticism is so feeble and short-lived for the want of any attention to those fundamental considerations with which Gourmont starts. Thus great quantities of criticism are quite vitiated by some emotionally puffed-up nominalism. Middle-aged gentlemen, for instance, did not like Swinburne and Mallarmé and Huysmans and Verlaine. So they became indignant and invented or reapplied a useful "swear-word." They called these writers "decadent" and it made them feel better. Gourmont disassociates the elements of the idea "decadent" and finds that it means fundamentally, when stripped of mysticism and indignation, such an absence of literary power as will manifest itself in a feeble imitativeness. And feebly imitative is what, of all things, the so-called "decadents" were not. Using his method of the analysis of essential notions Gourmont produced his great essays on style. To have read these is to see at once that not only the makers of the textbooks on composition but also Sir Walter Raleigh and even such charming practitioners as Stevenson and Pater never, in their theoretical essays, so much as scratched the surface of the problem of artistic expression.

The great impressionist critics, Jules Lemaître and Anatole France, had a constant tendency to become philosophical not in the sense of building a system of thought but in the sense of reexamining the character of human experience and human thinking. This tendency culminated in the work and personality of Remy de Gourmont. He is the latest of the illustrious critics of France and, to us, the most necessary and inspiring. For criticism will not fulfil its true function anywhere until its dealing with art and so with life is fortified by a scrupulous and uninhibited analysis of the ideas by which men live and the processes through which they express that living in words or colors or sounds. L. L.

Religious Knowledge in Homeopathic Doses

A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics. Edited by Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith. The Macmillan Company. $8.

THE American public shows enormous capacity for absorbing religious works of reference. Not counting the fact that all general encyclopedias contain a good deal of information on theology, we have, in English, "The Catholic Encyclopaedia," "The Jewish Encyclopaedia," "The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia," M'Clintock and Strong's "Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature," Hastings's "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics," and numerous smaller dictionaries of the Bible, of the Gospels, of Christian biography, of Sunday schools, and so forth. In addition to these Professors B. W. Bacon and W. W. Rockwell are planning to bring out through Appleton a large "Encyclopaedia of Christianity," and now we have, in one handy volume, a religious dictionary edited by two Chicago professors. It is intended presumably to meet the needs of the clergyman who has neither time nor money nor scholarly interest to invest in larger works of the same kind. It will probably be bought by most theological libraries.

The plan of the book set forth in the preface is supplemented by a statement of one of the editors in the article Science and Theology, which shows the spirit of the undertaking. His program calls for "the reorganization of religious thinking in accord with modern scientific principles. . . . It revises the theological theories of former ages as freely as science revises its theories. . . . Modern theology will discover and interpret the possibilities of worship in the world as explained by modern science." But as the conduct of a war is seldom on a level with the high-sounding phrases of the manifesto, so in this case we find that, while half the book is written by scholars of the most liberal Christian type, the other half has been supplied by conservatives and sectarians of various stripes.

Probably the failure of the editors to secure the same quality throughout the book as is found in their own articles and in those of some of their contributors is due to their desire to let each of a number of different denominations have a share in the work and an opportunity to present its own point of view. Of course none of the articles on non-Christian religions is written by an adherent of that special faith, nor is the article on Mormonism written by a Mormon, nor that on Roman Catholicism by a Catholic, nor that on the Anglican Church by an Anglican. But most of the Protestant denominations are treated from their own point of view, and the article on Christian Science is signed by "The Christian Science Board of Directors." It is one of the least judicious statements that ever found the way into a respectable book of reference—partisan, unscientific, and lightened with *suppressio veri.* From it we learn that Christian Science is "a scientific system of metaphysical or spiritual healing, discovered by Mary Baker Eddy in 1866," that it "is so called because of its exact and scientific nature. It implies a correct and demonstrable knowledge of God." If the abuse of language here is probably due to pure ignorance, what shall we say of the uncandid biography of Mrs. Eddy? We are informed that she was "a gentlewoman of culture and refinement" and that she "received a liberal education" including instruction in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek! Not a word is said about her three marriages, nor about her indebtedness to various quack healers whom she met. While the fact that she survived "fatal" injuries is set forth, her death is not mentioned; and, were it not for her handsome tomb in Cambridge, provided as it was for some time with a telephone in anticipation of her resurrection, we might conclude that she had found the way of Enoch and Elijah to the next world.

The social interests of the present day are well represented in the excellent articles by Mr. Tufts on the ethics of Capitalism and of the Labor Movement. The late Professor Rauschenbusch (who died in 1918, not in 1919, as here stated) offers a good survey of Christian Socialism. On the other hand, some of the historical articles do not recognize the influences of social forces in the past. An exception is Professor Mathews's treatment of Deism, which he considers an expression in theology of the social mind that in politics developed the English constitutional monarchy, God's prerogatives being transferred to natural laws as those of the king were to the nation. But the social content of Anabaptism is not hinted at, though in fact the most important thing about the Anabaptists was not their theology nor their anti-pedo-baptism, but their derivation from the disinherited, uneducated, lower classes. Their program of communism and their appeal to democratic sentiments was more decisive both for their fortunes and for their fate than was either their Biblicism or their emphasis on faith.

When Mark Twain, suffering from a carbuncle, read in Webster's that a carbuncle was a gem, he remarked that humor was out of place in a dictionary. Probably most editors think that originality is out of place in a dictionary. And yet there is an opportunity for research even in the short captions of a book of reference. As Mr. Crowley and certain German and Hungarian scholars are disputing over the Hittites, it is perhaps too much to expect that anyone should have the temerity to venture anything new on that subject. But in several lines the gate for original study was open, or would have been opened to one who knocked. Arminianism needs a thorough investigation, for it is one of the great forces of the seventeenth century and one that has been long neglected. There is a long and important unpublished autograph letter of Arminius, dated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

April 4, 1604, together with a number of other autograph letters of Gomarus, Lubbert, Pappus, Leyser, and other contemporary Dutch theologians, in the Pennsylvania Historical Society. Cannot some American scholar put them to good use? And further questions, such as the relations of Grotius and Milton to Arminianism are still unsettled, in spite of dogmatic statements on the subject. A footnote to the article on The Majoristic Controversy might have been found in an unpublished manuscript by Friedrich Reuber at Harvard. Still more do we need a thorough and impartial investigation of Freemasonry, here treated by Roscoe Pound. He fails to bring out the Deistic and republican purposes of the seventeenth century Free Masons, nor does he add anything to the question of the date of foundation. He dates the present revival from 1717; but how are we to interpret earlier allusions, as for example that in Dekker's comedy "The Shoemaker" (1600)? Still more perplexed is the case of the Rosicrucians, of whom the only sure thing said here is that "their history is very imperfectly known." When we read in Kuno Fischer's life of Descartes (5th edition, 1912, p. 176) that the whole thing started as a hoax, and as a satire on the Reformers by Valentine Andreae, and when on the other hand we come across numerous references to the brothers of the Rosy Cross in Ben Jonson's Masques, it is time for a careful study of the problem.

It is pleasant to speak of two or three particularly excellent features of this book. The article on Religious Journalism says that in the United States there are 900 religious periodicals, with a combined circulation of 16,000,000. Rufus M. Jones's definitions of mysticism and of cognate terms have all the charm which made a recent writer in the London *Times* hail him as, next to Henry James, the most interesting American writer on religion. A bibliography, good in spite of severe compression and apologetic interest, adds to the value of the work.

PRESERVED SMITH

One of Our Minorities

A Social History of the American Negro. By Benjamin Brawley. The Macmillan Company. $4.

The Negro in Literature and Art. Revised edition. By Benjamin Brawley. Duffield and Company. $1.50.

Songs and Tales from the Dark Continent. By Natalie Curtis. G. Schirmer. $4.

Rachel. Angelina W. Grimké. The Cornhill Company. $1.50.

PESSIMISTS to the contrary, there are unmistakable signs that America's most difficult problem, the relations between her white and colored citizens, is beginning to be flooded with the light of sane and intelligent reasoning. Ten years ago there were few books written on the Negro and most of those were the work of authors of strong and often violent Negrophobic views. Nowadays it is seldom that books antagonistic to the Negro are written and there is an ever-increasing stream of valuable contributions to the problem. This change is significant. Publishers are rarely ruled by sentiment. They know that there has been a very marked increase in the Negro reading public and also an increased interest on the part of a considerable number of white readers in the Negro problem and the problems of the Negro. Americans have a long way to go before they are willing to face courageously the unpleasant facts regarding lynching and the other injustices and brutalities that they have allowed the Negro to suffer. Yet it is encouraging that some of them are beginning to forsake the example of the ostrich, take their heads out of the sand, and realize the danger to America as well as to the Negro of allowing these injustices to continue.

Benjamin Brawley's "A Social History of the American Negro" is a distinct contribution to the literature of the problem. He begins with the coming of the first Negro slaves to America, traces the course of the Negro through the period preceding and during the Revolutionary War, tells of Negro revolts against the cruelties of slavery, and devotes the last part of the work, after including a chapter on the Negro republic of Liberia, to a discussion of the present acute situation with the increased and increasing tension in race relations in the United States. Mr. Brawley is an indefatigable student and has gathered and documented an immense amount of new material. It is perhaps unfortunate that the author's style is not a very readable one. Yet the facts which he gives are so striking that they suffer little from a lack of art in presentation. The book is a mine of information and is cordially recommended to students of the Negro problem and to all who may be interested in this most vital of American problems. It may be questioned whether Mr. Brawley was wise in devoting nearly three-fourths of his work to the pre-Civil War period. There can be no doubt that the last half century and especially the last ten years have seen a more rapid development of the Negro than any other period since the first Negro landed on American soil.

I cannot speak so well of Mr. Brawley's "The Negro in Literature and Art." He deals in this book with the achievements of the American Negro in literature, music, painting, sculpture, oratory, and dramatics. For having gathered a portion of the very considerable achievements of the Negro in the arts Mr. Brawley deserves credit. There can be little doubt that Du Bois in prose, Dunbar in dialect poetry, Burleigh in music, Tanner in painting, and Meta Warrick Fuller in sculpture occupy first rank among Negroes of genius. To those who are unfamiliar with what the Negro has done the book will be of value. Yet to those who know the extent of the creative genius of the American colored man the book will be disappointing. Mr. Brawley has merely affixed more firmly the laurels that decorate the brows of these who are already arrived. The undertaking of such a work by Mr. Brawley demanded the role of pioneer. It should have been his mission to explore unknown fields, seeking out and bringing to his reader's attention the considerable number of persons of little known but meritorious work. He calls William Stanley Braithwaite the foremost living poet of the colored race in America. Mr. Braithwaite ranks high as a critic and as the compiler of the annual anthology of magazine verse, but his poetry is not nearly as vital as that of James Weldon Johnson or Claude McKay, both of whom are only mentioned briefly in the chapter on Other Writers. Mr. Brawley seems not even to know Anne Spencer, a young colored woman who has done some excellent verse, nor does he know a number of other young writers of genuine ability.

"Songs and Tales from the Dark Continent" by Natalie Curtis (Burlin) stands as a monument to its author, who met her death in an automobile accident in France a few months ago. Mrs. Burlin was a musician of considerable ability which she devoted to a study and interpretation of the music of the American Indian and the Negro. Her "Songs and Tales" is a scholarly piece of work, combining, as the title signifies, in one volume both the legends and the songs of several African tribes. She does for African music the same service that Mr. Krehbiel did for the more familiar American Negro spirituals in his excellent work "Afro-American Folk Songs." Her material was obtained from a record of the songs as sung and the tales as told by C. Kamba Simango of the Ndau Tribe of Portuguese East Africa and Madikane Cele of the Zulu Tribe of Natal, South Africa. In her introduction Mrs. Burlin strikes a blow at fatuous beliefs in the God-ordained and inherent superiority of some races over others. Her statements regarding the extent of ability of the African are peculiarly prophetic in view of the recent discovery by Harvard University and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts of an ancient Ethiopian civilization at Napata in the Sudan. "Songs and Tales from the Dark Continent" is recommended without reservation to all who are interested in music or folk-lore or both.

"Rachel" by Angelina W. Grimké is an interesting departure by a colored writer into the field of play-writing. Miss Grimké has done a striking piece of work in portraying the burden of color in America. The play contains three strong scenes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First, when Rachel's mother, in their little home in a Northern city, tells of the lynching of their brother and father years before in the South; second, the tragedy of Tom, Rachel's brother, a college graduate and a civil engineer who cannot obtain employment because of his color, while Rachel, who led her class in domestic science, cannot secure a position as teacher for the same reason; and third, when Rachel refuses to marry the man she loves because she is unwilling to bring children into the world to suffer the acute soul-agonies that every cultured and self-respecting colored person feels in the face of unjust treatment. The book is a scathing indictment of American race prejudice that loses none of its strength by reason of the author's dispassionate treatment. Her language at times is a bit stilted and she does not always make her characters talk like normal human beings, but her pictures of the revolt of colored people against the bars of prejudice more than atone for any faults of style. The play was recently produced at the Neighborhood Playhouse in New York City and in the acting the faults of style were far less obvious.

WALTER F. WHITE

The Emotional Life of a Schoolgirl

A Young Girl's Diary. With a Preface by Sigmund Freud. Thomas Seltzer. $5.

WHILE Sigmund Freud writes the preface of this book no one must conclude that the author is anything but a thoroughly normal little girl. She is not a type which is classified as wayward among the poor and sent to a reformatory, or diagnosed as neurotic among the rich and sent to a sanitarium. In no sense can she be said to represent a *case*, moral or pathological. It may not be sufficient that Gretel Lainer was welcomed by the Vienna critics on her first appearance there as a healthy, wholesome, charming child; but the London *Lancet* also gives her a clean bill of health, which ought to carry weight with the American Medical Association. To appreciate the character of this child it is necessary to realize that she is not queer. Furthermore, she will never be queer, not though she lives to be a hundred. She will never even make a heroine for Mr. D. H. Lawrence or Miss Susan Glaspell, though there are other girls in the book who suggest these possibilities. It is conceivable that sister Dora might become a Lost Girl or that cousin Ada might pass irrevocably beyond the verge into a hinterland of fantasy; but little Grete will probably never be a very odd woman. She does not intrigue us by being not like other girls. It is one of the marvels of this delightful book that the heroine of the confessions has so little that is eccentric and different in her make-up and is yet so irresistibly engaging.

If she has a striking trait it is consistently counterbalanced by something which saves her from oddity. For instance, she possesses a keen and precocious intelligence, but along with it a delicious naivete which prevents an over-active brain from monopolizing the foreground of her personality. She is feminine through and through, but she struggles against the conventional limitations of her sex with that special access of fury which comes to one between the ages of eleven and fourteen. Her indignant outbursts over her brother Oswald's privileges indicate what it costs to adjust her to the conventional feminine role. "I should like to see what would happen if Dora or I wanted to go anywhere. A boy has a fine time. It's the injustice of the thing that makes me furious. . . . They throw every 2 in our teeth and when he gets several Satisfactories he can go wherever he likes. . . . And yet he goes on talking about being *subjected to intolerable supervision!* What about us? He can stay out until 10 at night and never comes to afternoon tea and in fact does just what he likes. If I go to supper with Hella and am just ever so little late, there's a fine row." In the midst of all this rage against certain aspects of the feminine role Gretel is quite ready to flirt with a lieutenant whom she meets at a school picnic on the beautiful blue Danube and to make eyes at a blond student in a Swiss hotel. Resignation is not Gretel's note; what she would like to have is nothing less than all the privileges of all the sexes.

She has positive ideas about friendship, a subject to which she has given a good deal of thought and regarding which she has reached very distinctive judgments. As she and Hella have been chums since both were in the second elementary, she considers herself an authority on that relationship. She was obliged, she says, to give the superior Oswald a piece of her mind on the subject. Oswald "laughed scornfully and said: That's all right, the friendships of *men* become closer as the years pass, but the friendships of you girls go up in smoke as soon as the first admirer turns up." "What cheek," says Gretel. On this theme of friendship she finds her elder sister Dora almost as impossible as the complacent Oswald. Dora has the extraordinary idea that a girl's own mother is her best friend! This is simply an outrage to Gretel's sense of propriety. "I must say that though I'm *awfully, awfully* fond of mother, I really can't imagine having her for a *friend*. How can one have a true friendship with one's own mother? Dora really can't have the least idea what a true friendship means. There are some things it's impossible for a girl to talk about to her own mother. . . . And what sort of friendship is it when Mother says to Dora: 'Dora, you *must* take your shawl with you.' Friendship between mother and daughter is just as impossible as friendship between father and son. For between friends there can be no orders and forbiddings, and what's even more important is that one really can't talk about all the things that one would like to talk of." With Gretel's ardent, outgoing disposition, admiration easily becomes affection, and affection, infatuation. Her chum, the more prudent and more egoistic Hella, strives vainly to hold her back from rash, headlong alliances. But not even the perfidy of the "cat" Anneliese or the treachery of the natural history professor, otherwise known as the Sun God, is sufficient to blight her buoyant trust for long. Her elastic adolescent system is able to tolerate one headlong adoration after another and her agile spirit is able to extricate itself unembittered from each successive crash.

Concerning parents as an institution Gretel has a few criticisms to make. Her own father is perfect, and her own mother is barely less than perfect. She must therefore take Hella's mother for the scapegoat. "Hella's mother says: 'We make such sacrifices for our children and they reward us with ingratitude.' I should like to know what sacrifices they make. I think it's the children who make the sacrifices. When I want to eat gooseberries and am not allowed to, the sacrifice is *mine*, not *mother's*." There is a good deal to be said for Gretel's view. The sacrifices which infants and children have to make, such as being weaned, learning to walk, acquiring decent habits, and the like, are usually credited by parents exclusively to themselves. But our twelve-year-old philosopher is assuredly in the right when she claims full credit for self-denial on giving up gooseberries, marzipan, and dolls. She knows quite well where the battle is fought. Another theory of Gretel's, evolved from the filial point of view, seems highly plausible. It refers to the well-known fact that mothers are reluctant to tell their children about the facts of reproduction. "Hella's mother always says that if one learns such things too early, one gets to look old. But of course that's nonsense. But why do mothers not want us to know? I suppose they're just ashamed."

The atmosphere of the schoolgirl world is reproduced with a clearness of detail from which one concludes that schoolgirls are fundamentally as international as bankers. Aside from a few characteristic touches of Vienna life, such as addressing the unmarried lady teachers as Frau instead of Fräulein, the ennobling of the Lainers, and the glamorous background of the military, Gretel might just as well be exploring life in Baltimore. Her dominating interests are her lessons, marks, examinations, promotions, matriculations; treats, vacations, holidays

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are the substance of her restless, eager thoughts. But underneath all these she is engrossed in a ceaseless, burdensome questioning concerning "segsual" matters. An active-minded girl of the objective, intellectual type, she strives incessantly by means of her imagination to make the universe in which she lives complete. She is acutely conscious that the world, as it is presented to her by the school curriculum and even by the educational methods of her liberal-minded parents, shows a great yawning gap of ignorance and mystery. To weave her fabric whole she finds no solid warp and woof of fact at hand, and so she makes a cobweb texture of fantasy and superstition. Yet she and Hella pride themselves on being very knowing. They hoot in private at their elders who still call them "innocent children" after they have reached the age of fourteen.

Their greatest difficulty arises from the painful dislocation between their public and their private interests. Neither Hella nor her sister, for instance, are indifferent students. They are the *cum laude* sort. At school they learn Latin, history, and mathematics from women doctors of philosophy; but they learn about life at home from Resi, the maid. They are well-brought-up girls of good family, yet they join Resi in a Peeping Tom escapade which makes them both ill. The pompous physician looks them over and gives his opinion unhesitatingly: "No girl ought to study; it does not pay. . . . This perpetual learning is poisonous to them in the years of development." But Gretel diagnosed her own malady more accurately. She comments pathetically: "So it must be true that one gets to look ill when one always has to think about such things."

The diary closes abruptly in the middle of her fifteenth year. As the curtain falls her heart is given wholly to Frau Doktor Mallburg, her favorite teacher, who has blotted out all other loves. The handsome Hungarian youth who furnished forth a radiant midsummer romance has paled into insignificance. "Jenö does not interest me in the very least. That was not *real* love. I don't care for anyone in the whole world except her, my one and only." It is easy to foresee that Gretel will not carry loyalty to the point where it becomes a vice instead of a virtue. Jenö's day will come again and another edition of the Sun God is morally certain to appear. There is no psychological suttee in this dear child's disposition. While she is capable of the utmost constancy, she has an overflowing tenderness which is forecast to chafe at the confinements of a stodgy, unrelieved monogamy.

The emotional authenticity of this book is indisputable. Whether it is a day-by-day record as it was kept by a girl between the ages of eleven and fourteen is more debatable. Perhaps it is an original document of adolescence subsequently revised and elaborated during the process of an "analysis." However it may have been produced, it has the rich and satisfying truth of art. Not even the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin has more reality. KATHARINE ANTHONY

Drama

Andreev and Vildrac

A CIRCUS—a gay, sad, multicolored little world of its own full of sharp, strange, stealthy conflicts and violences. The manager's wife is a lion-tamer. She keeps the accounts and has an enigmatical soul; she is in love with a fiery lion and with the bare-back rider Bezano. A broken-down Italian Count passes off Consuelo, the equestrian tango queen, as his daughter and sells her to Regnard, a baron, an obscenely fat old roué. Clowns, acrobats, ballet-girls adore Consuelo. She is the glint of sunshine on these turbid waves. A nameless one comes to be a clown, to amuse the populace by being slapped, to avenge himself upon those who have wronged him by the tragic poignancy of this abasement. This He Who Gets Slapped was a great gentleman in the world and a great thinker. A friend robbed him of his wife, stole his great thoughts and popularized them for the rabble, stripped him spiritually. Thus He, being too noble and sensitive to resist evil, flees to a clown's disguise. Here, too, a mission is given him. He saves Consuelo, who becomes to him an image of eternal beauty, shadow of her who rose from the foam of the Idalian sea, from the fat baron by poisoning her and himself. They die together. The fat baron shoots himself.

That is one way of telling the story of "He Who Gets Slapped." It is the discreet way. One could tell it in another way that would bring out the preposterousness of the fable, its essentially melodramatic character, its constant use of the device of antithesis in both emotion and action in the worst manner of Victor Hugo and the drama of 1830. But the first way of telling it is, perhaps, more just, since Andreev evidently wrote the play with an extreme discretion of touch and modulation and with a tinge of the spiritual bitterness and fatalism of the Russian soul that robs even melodrama of its sting. The drama as such, however, is not important, does not go deep. It takes old and sufficiently shabby inventions of the theater and gives them a touch of subtlety and of melancholy charm.

As there are two ways of recounting the fable of the piece, so there were, clearly, two ways of producing and acting it. The Theater Guild production at the Garrick is sensitive to an almost morbid point, consummate in its emphasis, modulation, rhythm of tone, color, movement. The sharp points of Andreev's antitheses are swathed, the sentimentality and violence of the last scene melt into tragedy under the sheer beauty of the handling. The art of the theater cannot go beyond what it accomplishes here—the directing of Robert Milton, the settings and costumes of Lee Simonson, the work of the actors: Frank Reicher's brilliant gaiety and corruption, Helen Westley's smoldering ferocity, the melancholy and the tragic irony of Richard Bennett, the dawn-like loveliness of Margalo Gillmore, the ponderous menace of Louis Calvert. But Andreev? "He is a poet," Alfred Kerr wrote; "he has a heart. But his heart is more noble than original. His eye is serious but sees no new path. His soul is human but it is full of traditional happenings and inherited emotions. He sees nothing for the first time. Yet that is what genius does."

That is what Charles Vildrac has done in his exquisite, fragile little masterpiece "The S. S. Tenacity" (Belmont Theater). Vildrac is a distinguished poet. He wrote "Images et Mirages" and "Le Livre d'Amour," which contain some of the most vibrant and moving of modern verses. But the dramatic reviewers of New York do not read French verse. They know the brass and tinsel of the boulevards: Bernstein and Guitry. The name of Vildrac did not give them pause. The result was an unparalleled exhibition of ignorance and mental immaturity, which culminated when a distinguished evening paper called Vildrac's play "nauseous trash." Inevitably the noblest and most beautiful French play produced here for years is not drawing adequate audiences; it may fail before these lines are printed.

Vildrac does not see shop-worn things in a new setting; he sees eternal things with a fresh vision. His fable is of the simplest. Two young Frenchmen are determined to emigrate to Canada. The stronger has persuaded the weaker that they must flee from the enslaving state that imprisoned them in blood and dirt for four years; they must seek liberty. But the ship on which they are to sail is unseaworthy. During the repairs they linger at an inn. Bastien, the strong, the seeker for freedom, falls in love with the little waitress. They yield to their mutual passion and flee to the North of France. Segard, the weaker of the two friends who has also loved Thérèse, sails on the Tenacity. Does he want to sail? Will he find liberty? Will Bastien find liberty in the end? He thinks he has it now because the chains of a fresh, young passion do not irk. There is old Hidoux who finds liberty—or is it slavery?—in white wine and in working only by the day. He will sell only a little bit of his liberty at a time. Yet this method has made him the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

servant of shiftlessness and loneliness. Is freedom then within? But Segard's choice is not his own. He felt sad and betrayed and fled. Is that a self-originating action? He leaves and the usual morning loiterers come to the inn. It goes on—the inscrutable flowing of the world. The dialogue is the perfection of a delicate adherence to nature with deep notes and searching implications that make the concrete flood infinity. The staging and directing of the piece are quite worthy of a Guild production at its best: Augustin Duncan gives the finest of his many superb performances; George Gaul, Tom Powers, and Marguerite Duncan are little if at all inferior to him.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

LECTURES *and* AMUSEMENTS

DEBATE: Can the Church be Radical?
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says "yes" **SCOTT NEARING** says "no"
DR. JUDAH L. MAGNES, Chairman
Lexington Theater, Sunday, February 12, 2.30 P. M.
TICKETS, $2, $1.50, $1, 75c., 50c — On sale at
Rand School, 7 E. 15th Street, and League for Industrial Democracy, Room 931, 70 Fifth Avenue. Mail orders filled in order of receipt.

RAND SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, 7 E. 15th Street.
PSYCHOANALYSIS
Twelve lectures by
DR. ALEXANDER A. GOLDENWEISER
Wednesdays, 8 p. m., beginning January 18. Fee, $4.

THE THEATRE GUILD PRESENTS
"He Who Gets Slapped" by LEONID ANDREYEV
English text by Gregory Zilboorg
GARRICK THEATRE, 65 West 35th Street

A Commercial Treaty

signed between Italy and Soviet Russia

The full text of this treaty (signed December 26) appears for the first time in English in the issue of

"SOVIET RUSSIA"

for February 1st.

"Soviet Russia" is the Official Organ of The Friends of Soviet Russia, an organization that sends relief to Russia to be distributed by the Soviet Government.

"Soviet Russia" prints the latest Russian official documents, the authoritative news on the famine, the announcements of the great steps being taken to open up Russia to American trade.

Semi-monthly, at all newsstands, Fifteen Cents. Subscription Price, $2.50 per year, $1.25 per half-year.

"Soviet Russia"

110 West 40th St., New York, N. Y., Room 304

EDGE OF THE JUNGLE

By William Beebe

HEYWOOD BROUN: "Deserves to be trumpeted as a notable volume. We nominate it as the book of books of the present season."

ATLANTIC MONTHLY: "Certainly no other pen has come so near to putting the jungle into print."

2d Large Printing
At All Booksellers, $2.00

Henry Holt and Company
19 West 44th Street **New York**

Practically immediate relief of pain follows a dose of

Midol

It is equally efficacious for
HEADACHE
TOOTHACHE
NEURALGIA

—and in addition to being absolutely safe to take —it has no undesirable after effects.

In aluminum boxes 2 sizes. At all druggists

General Drug Co.
94 N, Moore Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Where Belgian Labor Stands

THE political situation in Belgium resulting from the recent parliamentary elections, in which the Clerical Party increased its membership in the Chamber of Deputies from 73 to 82, while the Labor Party elected but 66 Deputies instead of the 70 members which it had in the former Chamber, is the subject of a comprehensive speech by M. Emile Vandervelde, former Minister of Justice, before the recent national congress of the Belgian Labor Party called to decide the question of Labor Party participation in the new Ministry. The Labor Party participated in the administration of the Government from November, 1918, to September, 1921, having four members in the Cabinet. This participation was authorized by the party congress held in 1918. The recent congress, however, at the conclusion of Vandervelde's speech, gave an almost unanimous vote against continuing the collaboration.

During the campaign the Clerical and Liberal parties brought the charge of antipatriotism against the Labor Party, and later attributed the Labor loss in the Chamber to the influence of this charge. Vandervelde, however, attributes the loss to the hostility of the liquor interests to certain prohibition legislation sponsored by Labor:

It was not the campaign against our patriotism, which endeavored to separate us from the nation, that caused us to lose four seats. It was the 50,000 saloon-keepers who gave their votes to the bourgeois parties. I repeat here what I said during the campaign. I would rather lose four seats in Parliament than to see the liquor traffic fill the insane asylums and almshouses. . . . Even without the four seats our parliamentary bloc will continue to be just as effective as it was before the recent election.

From the ardent enthusiasm of many of our members it was clear that they expected a different result. I did not share their sentiments. With parties as with nations, progress takes a spiral course. Outstanding victories are nearly always followed by difficult tomorrows. We gained 30 seats in 1919. We lost four of them in 1921. That is the law of rhythm. It is the march of the pilgrims of Echternach: three steps forward, one backward, then three forward. It is with the firm hope of very soon making these three new steps forward that we are to deliberate here today, and the more thoroughly we weigh the strength and the weakness of our situation the better will be our chances to take those three steps.

M. Vandervelde, unlike some intellectuals, does not believe in the possibility of progress of any labor movement unless it is rooted in the trade-union movement and expresses the fundamental aspirations and demands of the union workers.

In the first place, what is the condition of our trade-union movement? It was never so strong as at present. In January, 1919, there were 629,000 members of the unions affiliated with the Trade Union Commission. In January, 1921, the membership had risen to 718,000. Our trade unions are an enormous force upon which, in the last analysis, rests the entire political organization of the Labor Party.

From the political viewpoint our position is equally strong. We have 120 representatives in Parliament, 250 burgomasters, the majority in two provincial legislatures, and strong minorities in most of the other provinces.

But the organized employers, on the one hand, are making determined efforts in Belgium, as in other countries, to destroy the trade unions, and the enemies of political democracy are also active. Therefore the workers must be on their guard against any and all advances menacing their liberty:

In the face of these facts, I would be recreant to my conscientious duty if I did not say: Be careful; the times are dangerous; in spite of our unemployment insurance funds the reserve army of the unemployed is yonder, the redoubtable menace for our labor organizations. There must be firmness, even stubbornness; but there must also be discretion and sang-froid.

In the present Chamber of Deputies, as in the former Chamber, there is a definite democratic majority. But one would be blind not to see that this majority is composed of heterogeneous and doubtful elements. Undoubtedly it will stand together to check any openly reactionary attempts. But unfortunately the democratic majority does not seem capable of organizing itself for common action upon a common program.

In view of the fact that the Catholic Party has not an absolute majority in the Chamber of Deputies, it seems inevitable that the new Government must be either a Clerical-Liberal-Labor government or a Catholic-Liberal government. Some enthusiastic Catholics demand an absolute Clerical government. "Let them try it; it would be a short-lived affair." As to the three-party ministry, that is impossible. During the electoral campaign there was a labor mass meeting at La Louvière at which flags with the emblem of a soldier breaking his rifle over his knee were distributed. The flag was said to be simply an expression of labor's disarmament policy. M. Anseele, Labor Minister of Public Works, participated in the meeting. M. Devèze, Liberal Minister of National Defense, declared that the flag encouraged insubordination among the soldiers and demanded that M. Anseele withdraw from the Cabinet. All the Liberal and Catholic Cabinet members, including the Prime Minister, supported M. Devèze. Whereupon the four Labor members of the Cabinet resigned in a body. Consequently M. Vandervelde is not impressed with the possibility of renewing the policy of collaboration:

Others talk of a three-party government. The Catholic-Liberal combination was in complete agreement to put us out of the ministry. Perhaps they imagine that today we are in a mood to be put back. After the Louvière affair, after the outrage against the working class in the Anseele matter, it requires all the respect for formality acquired during three years of ministerial environment not to reply brusquely: "It was your wish that we get out of the Government. We got out. Now organize your own government from your own resources."

But Labor Party collaboration with the Catholics and Liberals to form a government is at least conceivable. In 1918 the trade-union movement instructed the Labor Party to permit four of its members to take seats in the Cabinet upon the definite government pledge that certain laws infringing the liberty of the workers should be repealed. The Labor Party obeyed the mandate of the trade unions. Under similar conditions it would do the same thing again:

It was for this reason that the Labor Party, responding to the wish of the overwhelming majority of the workers, declared that for a definite purpose it was ready, in the general interest of democracy, to accept all available cooperation.

Today as in 1918 we would participate in the Government if we could agree with the democratic fractions of the other parties on a program of action. But who will argue that at the present time such an agreement is possible? Governments of the sacred union, founded on the fiction of parliamentary unanimity, are dead. M. Devèze and M. Carton de Wiart gave them their death blow. Nevertheless, if the attempt should be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made to form a government from the democratic elements of the three large parties, there is nothing to prevent us making known our position in advance. We have on our immediate program for this session of Parliament the following bills: Generalization of social insurance, workers' control, socialization of the Campine coal mines, and the six months' military service bill, without speaking of the financial question which dominates all others. Should we be requested to enter a three-party government, our only question would be: Is it possible to reach an agreement upon these points? No? Then our participation in the Government is an absolute impossibility.

With the three-party government rejected, what remains for the proposed two-party government composed of Catholics and Liberals? Since M. Vandervelde made his keynote speech, M. Theunis has succeeded in organizing such a Government. Its essential character was forecast by the former Minister of Justice:

Undoubtedly an attempt will be made to bring forth a more or less hybrid combination—hybrid in appearance—in which the Clerical-Liberal coalition will undertake to dissimulate behind various sophistical phrases. Their camouflage will deceive no one. In the present state of bourgeois opinion, excited daily by the blustering blasts of the capitalist press, to govern Belgium without the working class is, because of this outside pressure, to govern Belgium against the working class. . . .

Consequently, our attitude with regard to the government in gestation is determined in advance. It is and should be an attitude of opposition. But this does not mean a negative and sterile opposition. We shall be tomorrow what we were yesterday. We are determined to continue our positive action of gradual realization. The program which we formulated for the parliamentary elections is still our program. And we must consecrate our best efforts during the coming months to the realization of this program.

Our prison-reform measure is ready; our measure for the reform of the administration of the insane asylums is ready; our measures for social insurance and the socialization of the coal mines are ready. We have been instructed by the Trade Union Commission to work for the enactment of a workers' control law; that bill is ready. The Mathieu bill—our six-months' military service measure—is ready and reflects in general what the army of a democracy should be. All of these measures are ready for parliamentary action. But to be genuinely efficacious this parliamentary action must be supplemented, extended, and stimulated by an intensive and methodical propaganda.

What about the vexing question of woman suffrage? Already applied in Belgium in municipal elections, shall it be extended to the provincial and parliamentary elections? The Labor Party is not a unit with respect to the advisability of making the extensions. But woman suffrage is an issue, and labor cannot avoid it:

Now I come to woman suffrage. Here I touch a delicate question. Already the Charleroi Federation has adopted a resolution in opposition to the extension of woman suffrage. Under these conditions it is incumbent upon me to make a very calm and clear declaration. I am ready to do so.

For a number of months the question of woman suffrage has been an open one. Those who oppose woman suffrage are free to vote against it; those who favor it are free to vote for it. Some thirty of us in the Chamber of Deputies have pledged ourselves to extend woman suffrage to the provinces in 1925, when the next elections take place. No congress can absolve us from that pledge. Our mandates may be withdrawn; but we cannot be compelled to forfeit our honor. Woman suffrage is moving forward. Under these conditions those who fail to place feminist propaganda in the forefront of their preoccupations are preparing grave deceptions for the Labor Party. . . .

After three years of participation in the administration of the Belgian Government, backed up by a Labor bloc of 70 in the Chamber of Deputies, what does the future hold for Labor as a party of opposition and with its bloc reduced to 66? The Catholics and the Liberals insist that the Labor Party has reached the maximum of its power, and that the next parliamentary elections will reduce its parliamentary strength still more. M. Vandervelde does not agree with Labor's opponents.

The three years which have just come to an end have been years of victory for Labor. We have housed an ample harvest. We have had the rare fortune to realize within a few months reforms that have been ripening during thirty-five years of effort. Our organizations have become formidable. Our political power under universal suffrage has spread to every section of the country. In the face of a divided bourgeoisie, the united proletariat has spoken many times with the voice of authority.

Now we are at the beginning of a new period. In the structure of democracy the class struggles will become, and are even now, more and more severe. It is not easy victories that we have in perspective; there will be bitter struggles and trying tests.

It is not of our choosing that labor's battle for emancipation is waged along this line. On the other hand, I am frank to say I do not regret it.

For parties as with individuals it is well now and then to live in difficult times. It is in struggle and by struggle that souls are tempered, that ideas are affirmed, that great hopes are widened. There is no royal road to reach the summit. There are but narrow paths in which we labor, endure, and suffer. We do not expect to free ourselves from them, for they lead to the goal! And we shall mount to the heights where the day-dawn of socialism shines resplendent!

Tiutiuniuk and His Polish Friends

THE so-called Ukrainian national movement headed by Petlura is still much misrepresented in other countries both as to its causes and its real extent. When Petlura's forces crossed the Sbrouch in October, 1921, and made their raid into Soviet Ukraine it was represented in almost all the foreign press as a nation-wide revolt in the Ukraine and Petlura and Tiutiuniuk were hailed as the deliverers of the country. Petlura's attempt was short-lived, but there is still a tendency to represent the casual skirmishes along the border line as an expression of popular revolt. Only recently the New York *World* printed a cable dispatch from its Warsaw correspondent picturing the Ukrainian movement as quite independent and aimed both against Russia and Poland. Of course there is a nationalistic Ukrainian or Ruthenian movement in Eastern Galicia (now under the Poles) and this will probably continue until some degree of self-government is granted to satisfy the national aspirations of the Ukrainians in Eastern Galicia. But this movement has nothing to do with the Petlura raids in Soviet Ukraine. The origin of the latter is shown in the following communication received by the representative in Germany of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic from the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Ukraine.

During the days of November 14 to 18 when the bands of Tiutiuniuk were routed the archives of his staff fell into our hands. The documents, consisting of orders beginning with August 15, at the time the attack was being prepared, letters, telegrams, military charts, statutes, reports, photographic pictures, statements, schedules, have now been put in order and the most essential of them will soon be published. However, it is possible to state conclusively that the bandit attack upon the Ukraine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was organized with the closest cooperation of the Second Division of the Polish army in Lvov (Lemberg), and that it was armed and subsidized by the Polish authorities. I reproduce here some of the most important documents:

An original order to the insurgent army signed by Tiutiuniuk under No. 1, dated October 21, 1921, and issued at Lvov. The text of the order:

"1. According to the order of the Chief Ataman I am, from this day, appointed commander of the insurgent army in the Ukraine.

"2. As chief of staff of the insurgent army is appointed Colonel Otmarstein whom I order to take office and to form his staff without delay.

"3. The partisan insurgent staff of the chief commandment of the Ukrainian troops is declared disbanded and in its place a Ukrainian bureau of press and information will be attached to the secret service of the Second Division of the Polish General Staff at Lvov.

"4. All officers, regulars, and officials who are released from their work on the staff of the insurgent army and do not enter the staff of the bureau of press and information should be immediately returned to the places of their former service.

"5. All commanding groups in the Ukraine and, through them, all commanders of regions are to become subordinate to me through the staff of the insurgent army.

"6. A financial buying committee is appointed to be made up of Eugene Arkhipenko and the members of the General Staff, Colonel Peressada and Lieutenant Nesterovsky.

"7. I appoint Colonel Stupnitzky commander of the second insurgent group. He should immediately form his staff and report on his taking office.

"8. All detachments coming from the concentration camps in the regions of Rovno, Kostopol, Mizk, and Kopitshnitzi are incorporated in the insurgent army. I order General Yantshenkov to form a Kiev division out of the detachments situated in the regions of Rovno, Kostopol, and Mizk. Colonel Lushchenko is appointed chief of staff of the Kiev division. Colonel Paley is to form a special detachment of the warriors and soldiers in the region of Kopitshnitzi in accordance with my instructions.

"9. Captain Chizhevsky is to form a staff 'hundred' out of the fourth artillery regiment of the fourth division. This 'hundred' to be at the disposal of the chief of staff of the insurgent army.

"Commander of the Insurgent Army
"(Signed) GENERAL TIUTIUNIUK"

Original order No. 2 signed by Tiutiuniuk, dated October 27, and issued at Lvov:

"The chief of the Ukrainian bureau of press and information at the Second Division of the Polish Staff is to be directly subordinated to the chief of staff of the insurgent army. As army comptroller is appointed Colonel Tugan-Baranovsky who is to take office immediately."

Besides Tiutiuniuk this order is signed, for the first time, by the chief of staff Colonel Otmarstein.

Order No. 3, of October 31, issued at the village Yasnoshir:

"Colonel Chizhevsky Grinko of the Third Sharpshooters Iron Division is provisionally appointed chief of the artillery of the insurgent army from the day on which Order No. 1 to the insurgent army was issued, i.e., October 21. Timoshenko Sergey is appointed political recorder of the insurgent army from October 31. The commander of the Fourth Sharpshooters' Division, Dobrotvorsky Joseph, is appointed to execute provisionally the duties of 'officer for messages' attached to the commander of the army from October 31. . . ." [Colonel Dobrotvorsky Joseph, mentioned here, is the man whom the Polish Government in its note claimed to know nothing of, although Colonel Dobrotvorsky served as communication agent between Tiutiuniuk and the Polish Ministry of War, as will be seen from the originals of the Polish telegrams published below.]

In the archives there is the text of a law of October 7, signed by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers Pilinchuk, Associate Minister of War Lieutenant Yarushevich, Secretary of State Shyanilo, and confirmed by the signature of Petlura and a postscript in Tiutiuniuk's own handwriting. One paragraph of this law says that it is to become effective on November 15, when it was expected a general uprising in the Ukraine would start as a result of Tiutiuniuk's attack.

By the Order No. 4, bearing the same signatures, the lieutenant of the navy Belinsky Michael, ex-chief of staff of the department of the navy in the government of the Hetman, is appointed chief for supplying the insurgent army from November 2. When Tiutiuniuk's bands were surrounded Belinsky committed suicide. . . .

The second category of documents is made up of orders issued to the staff of the insurgent army and signed by Colonel Otmarstein. These orders are dated since October 24 and issued at Lvov.

In Order No. 5 of October 28 it is proposed to enter in the income statement the amount of 100,000 marks and 30,175 czarist rubles received from the Polish citizen Lieutenant Kovalevsky. Lieutenant Kovalevsky, who has been repeatedly mentioned in our notes to the Polish Government, is serving in the Second Division of the Polish General Staff.

There have been seized in all 20 orders to the army, the last of which is dated November 12 at the village Zenkino.

Another document is Tiutiuniuk's order of October 27 from headquarters to the commanders of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth insurgent groups, in which the commanders are ordered to proclaim a general uprising in accordance with the instructions given out on August 15, 1921. Tiutiuniuk finishes this order with the words: "Together with my staff I cross into the territory of the Ukraine." To the order are also affixed the instructions of August 15, but in the archive only those instructions could be found which were sent to the commander of the second insurgent group Ataman Orlik, the commander of the third insurgent group Ataman Levchenko, and the commander of the fourth insurgent group Lieutenant Brovi. The first is ordered to prepare everything for the popular uprising before September 1; besides he is given the following assignments: to destroy the railway line Ovruch—Mozir—Malin—Kiev—Kazatin—Fastov—Vinnitza—Polonnoye—Berdichev—Zhmerinka—Rakhni and also Zhitomir—Kiev; to place detachments on all roads within 100 versts from the Pripet River leading to the north in order to cut off the retreat of the Red Army "when it flees to Russia"; to cut off every communication between the units of the Red Army and the staff of the Kiev military group.

The commander of the third insurgent group Levchenko is ordered to complete all preparations for the uprising by September 1, to destroy the railway communication between Homel—Bakhmach—Yampol—Konotop—Vorozhba—Lgov, to occupy Poltava and raid Kharkov in order to destroy the Soviet center in the Ukraine, to blow up the railway bridge at Kremenchug, etc. [Levchenko who had been at the head of a miserable band of 30 followers had been killed long since by Red Army detachments and his band had been annihilated.] The order to Ataman Brovi also provides for an uprising on September 1. Besides he is given the following assignments: destroy the railway communication between the Ukraine and the Don, capture the city of Yekaterinoslav, blow up the bridge across the Dnieper. In all the three orders there is one analogous paragraph stating: "All members of the Cheka and Communists to be shot." [Brovi is dead and his band has since been annihilated.]

The third group of documents bears upon the relations between Tiutiuniuk and the Second Division of the Polish General Staff. There is an interesting document No. 298, dated November 15, 1921, signed by the chief of the Second Division of the General Staff Colonel Kuzminsky and the chief of the organization section. On this document there is written in pencil "original"; it is addressed to Lieutenant Kovalevsky and it contains

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a report of the activities of the Second Division during the period from September 1 to September 15, 1921. Other interesting documents bearing upon the preparation of partisan detachments are represented in original telegrams in the Polish language of which special attention is deserved by the following: a telegram signed Ocheredko from Alexandrov, No. 267 of October 17, informing Dobrotvorsky at Lvov, Hotel European, that on Tuesday "150 have left and on Wednesday 400 more will leave." Another telegram of the same day sent from Warsaw by Kovalevsky, living there in Hotel Senoma on Elektoralna, room 17, addressed to the secret service department of the Second Division of the Polish General Staff for General Polozov. In this telegram Tiutiuniuk is informed that everything is in order and that Galayda will arrive in Warsaw without delay. [Galayda is Tiutiuniuk's personal adjutant.] . . .

Among the documents there are many legitimation cards, passes, and military railway tickets. One document was issued by the "expositura" of the Second Division of the Polish General Staff. The document bears the number 13107, is dated October 17, and was issued to Ribarchuk for the period of seven days with the right of going from Lvov to Tarnov and return. There is also a military railway ticket issued to the same Ribarchuk under number 654397. [Ribarchuk was manager of the economic department on the staff of Tiutiuniuk.]

Among other documents seized after the rout of Tiutiuniuk's band is a notebook of the same Ribarchuk in which are entered some of the chief expenditures, beginning with September 21, 1920. Among the income items in this note book is the sum of 46 million marks received from a certain foreign government. Among the expenditure items there is the sum of 15 million marks for the guard of the Chief Ataman, 3,486,000 marks for the maintenance of the general staff, 6,790,000 marks for the maintenance of the legislative council, etc. . . .

As a characteristic of the leaders of the new bloody adventure of Petlura in the Ukraine, which ended with the complete rout of his forces, it should be pointed out that Yurko Tiutiuniuk, the commander of Petlura's troops, is the same individual who, in May, 1919, as chief of staff of the Ataman Grigoryev, organized the bloody Jewish pogroms at Yelisavetgrad, Alexandria, Znamenka, and Kremenchug.

Kharkov, November 25, 1921 RAKOVSKY

A Latin-American Boycott

THE reception in Haiti of the report of the Senate Investigating Commission is indicated in the following appeal printed in the *Courrier Haitien* for December 31:

PEOPLE OF HAITI

Do not yield! Hold out!

Like ourselves, the whole world has read the important editorial which *Le Nouvelliste* printed yesterday and which we reprint elsewhere for our readers.

Our brother *L'Essor*, which also received that note, has summarized it as follows:

1. The Commission is unanimous in thinking that a small military force of Americans is necessary in Haiti, as well as the civil functionaries provided by the treaty of 1915, which they declare shall not be revised.

2. The Commission believes that a high commissioner with diplomatic powers and ranking all other American civil and military authorities should be appointed.

3. The loan will be forced upon us without delay.

What, under such circumstances, should be the attitude of the Haitian people, who are longing so ardently for independence, liberty, and their own sovereignty? After the Marne the French were in peril of lapsing into discouragement, but the Government and Joffre raised the morale of the French people so that they held out. The great victory came not less than four years later.

When France saw that she could not fight off her colossal enemy she appealed to the whole world, which came to her aid. In 1917, when she saw that it would mean her defeat if the Germans still held out much longer, she sent Joffre to the United States for help.

"Send us 200,000 men." "Not at this moment," answered Uncle Sam. "We want to make our preparations; we shall come to your assistance, but much later!"

"We need help immediately; send us one hundred thousand, fifty thousand, or only twenty thousand, but send them as quickly as possible, at once!"

Uncle Sam carried it through and a few months after the arrival of the first American contingent we had the armistice of 1918.

You, too, people of Haiti, must not lose courage! You must forsake your splendid isolation and turn your attention to the rest of the world. Do you think England would have given independence to Ireland if certain peoples had not exercised a moral pressure upon her?

Therefore, you must inform the civilized world of your case by sending delegates all over the earth. Above all do not allow yourselves to become discouraged. Your cause is good. It is holy. He who does not love his country does not love his God. . . .

Poland, after a century of servitude, a century of martyrdom, since the end of the Great War has been free, independent, and sovereign. . . . After Poland, it was Ireland's turn. Now Egypt and India demand their independence. And you yourselves, people of Haiti, would you be pusillanimous to the point of giving up the fight and abdicating your rights? We do not believe it. We do not ask you to make war with fire and sword, to take up arms in order to regain your sacred rights. No, no, let us tell you that this brutal way would bring you final defeat. A pigmy cannot fight alone against that colossus, that giant, Uncle Sam. What we ask of you is, not to give in, not to abdicate your rights, to stay in the positions which you already hold.

For instance, you are against the loan; be always against it. If the Government, because pressure is exerted upon it as in 1915, has to yield, make your own reservations, people of Haiti. For ourselves we swear to the sacred souls of Dessalines, of Pétion, and of all the other heroes of Haitian freedom that we shall not give up the fight before either final victory or our death, and in the latter case our children will continue the fight for us.

But we see that this new fight which we are going to launch will lead in a new direction. We must now make our appeal to the civilized world by convincing it of our just claims. We of the *Courrier Haitien* are of this opinion, and, united with our brave and valiant brethren of Santo Domingo, we have initiated a press congress of the Latin-American countries, which will be held in the near future at Santo Domingo. Our editor-in-chief, who plans to go to Santo Domingo in January, will during his stay there work out with the collaboration of his Dominican brethren the program of the congress.

Being the only French-speaking people in the new world, Haiti has too long lived in isolation. A Latin country, she should affiliate herself with the other Latin countries of this hemisphere.

Though we cannot for a single moment think of using force in order to regain our rights, it is not forbidden for us to launch an economic war by asking all the people of Latin-America not to buy any products of the great North American nation as long as Haiti and Santo Domingo are occupied by American troops.

People of Haiti, as the Haiti-Santo Domingo Independence Society has told you in its cable of December 28, addressed to Mr. Georges Sylvain, the devoted, energetic, and active head of the Union Patriotique, the struggle has just begun. Let no Haitian be discouraged! This is the moment to close ranks.

People of Haiti, do not yield, hold out, and final victory will crown your courageous and constant efforts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED